Wednesday, April 22, 1953

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

OFFICIAL REPORT

PARLIAMENT SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price Six Annas (Inland)
Price Two Shillings (Foreign)

Gazette & Publication Section
Parliament Library Building
Room No. FB-025
Block 'G'
Acc. No. 25154
Dated 21.11.2014

THE PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

(Part I—Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 22nd April, 1953

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

EXPANSION OF PORCELAIN FACTORY AT BANGALORE

*1514. **Dr. Ram Subhag Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether Government intend to expand the Porcelain Factory at Bangalore to manufacture high tension insulators?

(b) If so, what is the estimated cost of that expansion scheme?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes, Sir. The Government of Mysore have a proposal to expand their Porcelain factory at Bangalore to manufacture High Tension Insulators.

(b) Rs. 75 lakhs approximately.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether that expansion programme is going to be undertaken by the Government of Mysore itself, or have they entrusted the expansion work to any company?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: So far as I understand, Sir, it is going to be a purely Mysore Government matter.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: What would be the annual manufacturing capacity of the factory when the expansion programme is completed?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Their installed capacity at present is 650 tons; it is proposed to expand it to 2,400 tons.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know, Sir, whether the required technical hands are available in the country for that expansion work of will the be imported from other countries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In this particular case there is a tie-up with a Japanese firm and they are supposed to furnish the necessary 'know-how' to the Mysore Government. Besides we have got an expert from one of these United Nations Technical Assistance Administration who is available in the country, and whose services will be used by the Mysore Government for going ahead with their expansion programme.

Shri T. K. Chaudhuri: May I know who exactly owns this **factory—the** Central Government or the Government of Mysore?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I said it is a Mysore Government matter.

JUTE FACTORIES

*1515. **Shri B. K. Das:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that experiments have been carried out by a team of textile scientists at Leeds University to produce the most fashionable clothing and furnishing fabrics from jute;

(b) whether the representatives of the Indian Jute Mills Association have associated themselves with these experiments; and

(c) whether any steps have been taken to make the experiments a practical enterprise with a view to finding a better market for jute fabrics all the world over?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Government understand that the position is as stated. They are advised, however, that it would be an exaggeration to say that jute can be used for the manufacture of "most

fashionable clothing and furnishing fabrics".

(c) The experiments regarding manufacture of clothing material from jute are reported to be still at laboratory stage. As regards furnishing fabrics some of the Indian Mills are known to have manufactured them successfully.

Shri B. K. Das: Was such an experiment carried out in India also?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir; I think the Institute connected with the IJMA is carrying out these experiments.

Shri B. K. Das: Is it expected that the cost would be cheaper than that of similar fabrics produced out of other materials?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is rather a complicated matter. Some time back when I was in Calcutta I visited this Institute and saw the experiments that are being conducted. Some of the fabrics are mixtures—not merely jute fibres, but also some kind of art silk. When things are in laboratory stage it is rather difficult to evaluate the cost and find out whether it will be ultimately economical or not.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : मैं यह जानना चाहता था कि क्या इन फ़ेबरिक्स से मोटे कपड़ भी बन सकते हैं, जो गरीब आदमियों के इस्तेमाल में आ सकें, या इन से सिर्फ़ फशनेबुल कपड़े ही बनाये जाते हैं ?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, the cloth is coarse in the sense that it would be rather thick. But sometimes coarse cloth is also fashionable.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, whether the Research Institute in West Bengal is also carrying out research of the mixtures of jute, cotton and other things?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have seen various types of mixtures which they have produced. Sometimes it is art silk, sometimes it is silk—all kinds of experiments are being made.

Requisitioned Houses

***1516. Shri Bahadur Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state what is the number of houses requisitioned in Delhi under the Requisitioning and Acquisitioning Immoveable Property Act, 1952, during the year 1952?

(b) Have any houses been derequisitioned during the year 1952?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) 51.

(b) Yes, Sir. 62.

Shri Bahadur Singh: May I know, Sir, whether Government guarantee payment of rent to the owners whose houses are requisitioned?

Shri Buragohain: Rents are regularly paid to the landlord—owners of the houses.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : गवर्नमेंट ने पबलिक से जो हाउसेज लिये हैं, उनको किन २ आवश्यक कामों में ला रही है ?

Shri Buragohain: The houses requisitioned by the Collector of Delhi were requisitioned for school purposes, godowns for rationing, residential, office and municipal health services.

Shri Bahadur Singh: Have the Government received complaints that several occupants did not pay their rents to the owners?

Shri Buragohain: If any specific case is brought to the notice of Government, we might look into it.

Shri Gidwani: When the houses are requisitioned are all those who are already living there provided with alternative accommodation?

Shri Buragohain: Every effort is made to provide alternative accommodation.

Egyptian Cotton Delegation

***1517. Shri V. P. Nayar:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether it is a fact that a Three-member Official Egyptian Cotton Delegation headed by Mr. Hassan Mawardi visited India in January, 1953?

(b) If so, did the Government of India have discussions with the Mission?

(c) If the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, do Government propose to lay on the Table of the House a note containing the details of the discussion?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes.

(b) No.

(c) Does not arise.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know, Sir, whether Mr. Hassan Mawardi was sent at the instance of the Government of India, or by the Egyptian Government?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, the Government of India had nothing whatever to do with it. It was entirely a non-official mission which did not even contact the Government of India as such.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know, Sir, whether Government are aware that paper reports showed that Mr. Hassan Mawardi came to India representing the Egyptian Government for Government to Government talks?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I do not know, Sir, what papers say. All that I know is that we have had no information of the fact that it is a Government Delegation, nor did that Government as such contact us.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Is it not a fact, Sir, that in recent years the United States of America has increased its export of raw cotton to India and thus tried to squeeze out Egypt from the market? Is it also not a fact.....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order; these are too large questions to be answered.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Is it not a fact that because Egypt is being gradually squeezed out of the market, especially in the supply of raw cotton the Egyptian Government sent a delegation here?

Mr. Speaker: I think that is a question to be put to the Egyptian Government rather than to the Government of India.

Duty on Pepper and Cardamom

*1518. **Shri V. P. Nayar:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to refer to the answer to unstarred question No. 1, by Mr. N. S. Nair, asked on the 5th November, 1952 and to lay on the Table of the House a statement showing the amounts levied as duties on pepper and cardamom during the years 1950, 1951 and 1952?

(b) Is any amount being spent by the Government of India in finding out new markets for these commodities or for getting better prices from established markets?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A statement giving the desired information for the financial years 1950-51 and 1951-52 is laid on the Table of the House.

(b) No amount is specifically spent for the purposes mentioned, but our exporters derive not inconsiderable benefits from the services of our Commercial representatives abroad.

STATEMENT

The import duties collected on pepper and cardamom during the years 1950-51 and 1951-52.

Year	Import duties collected on	
	Pepper	Cardamom
	Rs.	Rs.
1950-51	37,174	2,029
1951-52	72,697	11,619

Shri V. P. Nayar: Has any effort been made to sell pepper to countries in Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R. and China?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would ask for notice of the question.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know whether the efforts of our commercial representatives have produced better trade with these countries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is the present understanding of Government.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Is it not a fact that pepper prices are subjected to occasional rises and falls because pepper is a monopoly of established markets?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Oftentimes these rises and falls are manipulated in internal markets which sometimes react adversely with possibilities of our having a stable export trade.

Shri A. M. Thomas: May I know, Sir, what has been the basis of the levy in these years—*ad valorem* or otherwise? Was the levy uniform and do Government propose to continue the present rate?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The question relates to import duties. My

hon. friend wants something about export duties. I can say that in regard to cardamom there is no export duty: in regard to black pepper it is 30 per cent. *ad valorem*, subject to a maximum of Rs. 150 per cwt. Surely hon. friend does not expect me to tell him that we propose to reduce it or raise it in the near future.

OIL REFINERIES

*1519. **Shri Jasani:** (a) Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state what is the total annual production of refined oil estimated from the three oil refineries when they go into production?

(b) What will be the total annual consumption of crude oil?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) The total annual production of refined oil from all the three refineries, when in full operation, would be about 3·4 million tons per annum.

(b) The total annual consumption of crude oil by these refineries will be about 3·8 million tons per annum.

Shri Jasani: May I know from what sources we get this crude oil? Have we made any contract for the supply of this oil with other countries?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Government have made no contracts for importing crude oil. Companies who are starting refineries will import crude oil. Crude oil is not available in our country, at present in sufficient quantities.

Shri Jasani: May I know the names of those companies with which Government has entered into contracts to start refineries in our country?

Shri K. C. Reddy: It has been answered so many times. They are Burmah-Shell, the Standard Vacuum Oil Co. and Caltex (India) Ltd.

Shri Jasani: What is the total annual requirement of refined oil for our country?

Shri K. C. Reddy: It is a confidential matter. I may state however it is about 4 million tons at present but it is not a static demand. It varies.

Shri Nanadas: May I know whether these companies have got any guarantee that they will get the required supply of crude oil?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Yes, they have assured themselves that sufficient quantities of crude oil will be available for refineries.

FULL EMPLOYMENT OF VILLAGE

*1520. **Shri S. N. Das:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether the plan for full employment of a village published by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi in which formation of labour banks for full utilisation of the full resources by capitalisation of manpower has been suggested, has been studied and examined by Government?

(b) If so, do Government propose to open centres for testing the soundness of the proposition?

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): (a) Yes.

(b) No. The Government will, however, watch with considerable interest the results of the experiments which the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi will carry out in certain centres which have been recently selected by them.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the Government is aware of any centres having been selected and worked out by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi for implementation of the plan and if so, whether the Government of India proposes to send some of its officers to study the working of the plan?

Shri Nanda: Four centres have been selected for the implementation of the scheme and the selection of the 5th unit is also under consideration. Certainly the Government will keep in very close touch with the progress of this experiment.

Shri S. N. Das: In view of the importance of the plan, may I know whether Government propose to give wide publicity to this plan by printing the details in every State language and distributing them in the country?

Shri Nanda: The institution concerned is doing the needful in the matter and what further requires to be done will also be considered by the Government.

Shri T. S. A. Chettiar: What are the names of these 4 centres and will the Government please lay on the Table of the House the results of the experiments of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi?

Shri Nanda: The 4 places are:

(1) Balrampur, District Midnapur.

(2) Vallabhnagar, Rajasthan.

(3) Bhilwada, Rajasthan.

(4) Ekhatpur, District Sholapur.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : गांवों के बे रोजगार लोगों को रोजी देने की जो योजना बनाई जायगी उस में शेडयूल्ड कास्ट के लोगों को तरजीह दी जायगी या नहीं ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Gadgil: May I know whether Government has studied both these schemes with a view to compare and find out which is better?

Shri Nanda: The Government has studied very carefully the scheme which is incorporated in this publication.

Some Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: I think it will be better if questions are put to the authorities of the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi if hon. Members so desire.

NEW AREAS FOR COMMUNITY PROJECTS

***1521. Shri L. N. Mishra:** (a) Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state whether some selection of new areas for community project works has been made?

(b) If so, what is the number of such projects to be undertaken and the name of the places of such work?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) and (b). Attention is invited to supplement to Operational Agreement No. 8 on Community Development Programme a copy of which was laid on the Table in reply to Starred Question No. 979 on 25th March 1953. Selection of areas will be made after proposals have been received from all State Governments.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether these 55 blocks are divided Statewise?

Shri Hathi: Yes. They will be allotted to almost all the States.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know whether the progress has been retarded for want of trained personnel?

Shri Hathi: That is not so in all cases. In two cases only that was the position.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know the main features of discussions in the conference of Development Commissioners recently held about community projects?

Shri Hathi: There is a separate question and on that I am going to reply. The report will be laid on the Table as soon as it is finalised.

Shri Raghuramaiah: May I know whether in making these selections, the members of the local legislature of the respective areas concerned are consulted so that their requirements may be assessed?

Shri Hathi: The State Government should do that.

Shri Altekar: May I know the criteria on which selection is made?

Shri Hathi: The criteria should be the progressive results achieved in respect of the implementation of the projects taken up in 1952-53 and the State Government's preparedness to share additional responsibility in the programme. These are the general criteria.

Kumari Annie Mascarene: May I know whether Government is aware that the man-power in these villages is utilised not on the basis of villages but on the basis of forced co-operation?

Shri Hathi: I have no information. There is no forced co-operation.

Shri Chinaria: May I know that due consideration will be paid to unirrigated areas this time?

Shri Hathi: That will be taken into consideration.

ALL INDIA PRINTERS' CONFERENCE

***1522. Shri S. N. Das:** Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India, Department of Printing and Stationery was represented at the All-India Printers' Conference held in Bombay recently;

(b) if so, who was deputed to represent the Department;

(c) whether the Government of India have received a copy of the resolutions passed by that Conference; and

(d) if so, whether the suggestions and recommendations made there have been considered?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the attention of the Minister was drawn to the report published in the newspaper about this conference?

Sardar Swaran Singh: Yes, Sir.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know whether the proposal with regard to the establishment of an all-India Institute for Training and Research in the art of printing is being considered or is likely to be considered by the Government in view of the importance of the subject?

Sardar Swaran Singh: It is a suggestion for action. It is not being considered at the moment.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN HILLI DISTRICTS AND TRIBAL AREAS

*1523. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the programme of Community Development is handicapped because of the dearth of technicians in backward hilly districts and remote tribal areas; if so, the names of such areas;

(b) whether Community Projects Administration has appealed to patriotic citizens of the country to come forward in tiding over this shortage;

(c) if so, how many persons have offered their services and how far this shortage has been met; and

(d) whether Government contemplate taking any measures to avert recurrence of such handicaps for want of technical hands, in the programme of Community Developments in the backward hilly districts and remote tribal areas?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) to (d). Assam and N.E.F.A. requested for Agricultural Engineers, Overseers, etc. The Community Projects Administration had issued a Press Note appealing to technicians to volunteer for backward areas. Names of suitable candidates in Government service and also a list of 136 technical personnel who applied in response to the Press Note have been furnished to the State Governments for their consideration. It is proposed to circulate similar lists from time to time.

Shri Rishang Keishing: May I know if any hillman has responded to the appeal and if so of which State?

Shri Hathi: From the list, perhaps I do not find any coming from the hill tribes.

Mr. Speaker: From which State?

Shri Rishang Keishing: May I know why any adequate measure to avoid such handicap was not taken before?

Shri Hathi: Efforts were made to obtain technical personnel from the area.

Shri Rishang Keishing: May I know whether Government of India contemplate to open more community centres in the backward hill areas during the coming years?

Shri Hathi: Government is already having 55 blocks and out of these some will be allotted to this area.

ADMINISTRATION OF N.E.F. AGENCY

*1524. **Shri Gohain:** (a) Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state how far the implementation of the reorganisation of administration in the N.E.F. Agency has progressed?

(b) What are the main features of the reorganisation?

(c) What amount has so far been spent?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) Considerable progress has been made in the implementation of the Reorganization Scheme in respect of the Administration of the North-East Frontier Agency.

(b) The main feature of the Reorganisation Scheme is the opening up of new Administrative Centres in regions in the interior which were almost completely neglected during British administration. Improvement of communications is being given high priority. The opening of Schools, Hospitals and Dispensaries, Agricultural Demonstration Farms and Depots for the supply of essential commodities at reasonable rates are amongst the more important features of the Reorganisation Scheme.

(c) Rs. 31,46,500.

Shri Gohain: Is it the intention of the Government to appoint local hill men in the various services though they are less qualified in comparison with the plains men?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: As a matter of fact, every effort is made to employ local people and quite a number have been employed. It is difficult for me to say about any particular piece of work, whether we can employ lesser qualified men. Generally speaking, every effort is being made to that end.

Shri Gohain: May I know whether a small aeroplane will be supplied to the administration?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Yes; I do not know if it can be supplied to the Agency. We are trying to find out what air communication we can establish there at proper places, possibly including helicopters.

Shri Nanadas: Arising out of the answer, may I know whether there is any landlordism in that area, and if there is no landlordism whether the people are free to get land?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am afraid I could not answer that question with any certainty. I doubt very much if there is anything in the nature of landlordism there.

Mr. Speaker: I doubt whether this arises out of the question. Next question.

SURVEY OF BURIDIHING RIVER VALLEY

*1525. **Shri Gohain:** Will the Minister of **Irrigation and Power** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of India have taken any steps to make a survey-contour or otherwise and collect hydrological and other data, of the Buridihing river in the State of Assam for alleviating the sufferings of the people of the Buridihing valley from the effects of floods; and

(b) if so, when the survey will be completed and action taken thereon?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Shri Gohain: May I know whether the Government propose to give any interim relief to the people in the valley of the Buridihing river?

Shri Hathi: The State Government are taking measures to give interim relief.

SALT

*1526. **Shri K. P. Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are thinking of importing rock salt from Pakistan; and

(b) the total amount of salt required for the country?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Production (Shri R. G. Dubey): (a) No.

(b) The total estimated requirements of salt during the year 1953 are 725 lakh maunds.

Shri K. P. Sinha: May I know the quantity that is going to be imported?

Shri R. G. Dubey: No, Sir. There is no question of importing any salt because India has already reached the stage of self-sufficiency in salt as far back as 1951. The question of importing any salt does not arise.

COMMERCIAL REPRESENTATIVES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

*1527. **Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the countries where India has maintained commercial representatives?

(b) What are the functions of these representatives?

(c) What is the total volume of transactions handled by these representatives?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 5.]

(b) The main functions of the Indian Trade Representatives abroad are to promote our trade particularly on the export side and generally to look after all our trade interests in the countries under their jurisdiction and also to keep the Headquarters posted with latest information on economic and commercial matters in those countries through periodical reports.

(c) As trade is not generally handled by our Trade Representatives, it is not possible to give any precise information in this regard.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether any uniform procedure has been drawn up regarding the transactions to be conducted by these trade representatives abroad?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir. The type of work that they have to do, the type of report that they have to send are contained in a circular that is issued to all trade representatives abroad and the practice generally is uniform subject to such variations as are necessary because of local conditions existing in that particular area.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: May I know whether these representatives are subordinate to the Embassies

functioning in the various countries or are they subordinate direct to the Government of India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Naturally everybody is subordinate to the Government of India. They have to work under the local Embassies.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: What are the arrangements made by the Government of India in countries where there are no commercial representatives?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If we have no representatives commercial or otherwise we seek the aid of friendly powers if any difficulty arises.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know what is the justification for these commercial representatives? Is it the justification of the existing trade or the future trade?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: As the hon. Member knows India attained her freedom about 6 years back and we are building up our commercial service. I think year after year, it is becoming more efficient. I do think there is ample justification, Sir, for building up that service in view of the existing trade that we have and in regard to the anticipations that we have for the future.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know in which of the countries of Eastern Europe, and U.S.S.R. and China we have trade representatives at present?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: If the hon. Member would put down a question, I shall answer specifically. Wherever we have Embassies, we have people attached to the Embassies to look after our trade interests.

SYNTHETIC PETROLEUM

*1529. **Shri C. R. Chowdary:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether any survey was conducted by experts, to find out the feasibility or otherwise and to determine the possibilities of producing synthetic petroleum from Indian coal?

(b) Was there a report submitted by experts to Government in this respect?

(c) If so, do Government propose to lay it on the Table of the House?

(d) Is it a fact that the experts were of opinion that a synthetic petroleum plant could be set up economically in India?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) and (d). The Report contains description of certain processes and includes some Blueprints and designs for which "Patent" rights have yet to be taken out. The Report is therefore treated as a secret document. It cannot, therefore, be made public.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know the reason why this scheme was abandoned by the Government of India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Primarily, costs. Secondly, we want to see how these new refineries that have been set up are going to work before we embark on expenditure in this connection.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know the percentage of return that was expected of this project if established?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The project has undergone various changes. Initially Messers. Koppers produced a scheme. The devaluation came and we found that the costs had gone up. We asked them to produce an amended scheme. We had also negotiations with other people. I am not able to say precisely what the expectations are. But, I can say that in the initial project, the expectation was 65,000 tons of Aviation petrol, 67,000 tons of motor petrol, 10,600 tons of diesel oil and 7,400 tons of fuel oil, a total production of about 150,000 tons of synthetic oil and 500 tons of domestic coke. Thereafter we had other projects under consideration where the output was not quite so big. The whole matter is now, for the time being, deferred.

Shri C. R. Chowdary: May I know the cost that was expected to be incurred per gallon of aviation petrol and motor petrol?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am sorry I cannot give a break-up of production costs.

Dr. Jaisoorya: Is it not a fact that in the previous House, the Deputy Minister for Commerce and Industry told the House that the proposition was quite profitable and economic?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should certainly defer to the superior wisdom of the hon. Member. It may be right.

Shri Sarangadhar Das: May I know if the Orissa Synthetic Petrol proposition for which the Government of Orissa has advanced Rs. 6,66,000 for preliminary investigation, is a feasible proposition and whether Government of India has considered it?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I have no precise knowledge of this Orissa scheme though I know that there was some such scheme. I am not able to give any information about it.

SALT (IMPORT)

*1530. **Prof. D. C. Sharma:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state the quantity of salt imported from West Pakistan in 1952?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Production (Shri R. G. Dubey): No salt was imported from West Pakistan in 1952.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know, Sir, if there are any rock salt mines in India, and if they are being worked to their full capacity?

Shri R. G. Dubey: As far as my knowledge goes, it is in Mandi that there is probability of developing this particular variety, and the Government are trying to develop this.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: What was output of rock salt in Mandi last year?

Shri R. G. Dubey: There has been no output so far, but Government are contemplating certain schemes to develop this source.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: May I know, Sir, when the scheme will come to fruition so far as Mandi is concerned?

Shri R. G. Dubey: Just now I am not in a position to say.

Shri V. P. Nayar: Is it not a fact that for certain purposes like medicinal preparations rock salt alone can be used, and may I know what is the annual requirement of rock salt?

Shri R. G. Dubey: I require notice for this question.

Shri V. P. Nayar: May I know from which countries we get rock salt now for such exclusive purposes?

Shri R. G. Dubey: So far we have not got, but in the case of Kashmir we made an exception for certain political reasons, and Kashmir was allowed to import a certain quantity of rock salt.

INDIAN TEA LICENSING COMMITTEE

*1531. **Shri K. C. Sodhia:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state what funds and other properties are owned by and vested in the Indian Tea Licensing Committee as on the 31st March, 1953?

(b) What are their liabilities, if any, as on the 31st March, 1953?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) The funds of the Committee on the 31st March 1953 amounted to Rs. 2,47,622/7/2. The value of other properties, consisting mainly of furniture and fixtures, as on the date, is estimated at Rs. 20,000. In addition, licence fees amounting to Rs. 9,642 were due from tea estates on that date.

(b) The liabilities of the Committee on the date amounted to Rs. 29,000.

Shri K. C. Sodhia: Will this Committee remain after the Tea Board has been constituted?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, if the House approves of the Tea Bill which is now before the House, this Tea Licensing Committee would be dissolved and the Tea Board will take over its functions.

SIXTH INTERNATIONAL FILM FESTIVAL

*1532. **Sardar A. S. Saigal:** (a) Will the Minister of **Information and Broadcasting** be pleased to state whether Government will participate in the Sixth International Film Festival to be held near about the 3rd April, 1953 in Cannes?

(b) Have Government responded to the invitation of the French Government to participate in the Festival?

(c) How many kinds of films will be sent for the Festival and who will represent Government?

(d) What expenditure have Government to bear on this account?

The Deputy Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Shri Buragohain): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir.

(c) Long films and short films have been entered. Our Ambassador in France is representing the Government of India.

(d) Cost of prints and packing and forwarding charges in respect of the films produced by the Films Division; these amount to about Rs. 1,000.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: May I know, Sir, how many films were sent?

Shri Buragohain: Four films have been sent for this particular festival.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: May I know, Sir, whether India participated in any film festival and any reward was received by India?

Shri Buragohain: India has been participating in the International Film Festivals since 1948, and we have been earning awards in every year since 1949.

Sardar A. S. Saigal: May I know, Sir, if any coloured film was sent previously, and what was the cost of it?

Shri Buragohain: We have produced the first technicolour documentary, and this has now been sent to France for the film festival now being held there.

Shri Raghuramaiah: May I know, Sir, whether any South Indian film is included in these four films?

Shri Buragohain: So far as I can see, I do not find any, Sir.

Shri Kasliwal: Could he give the names of the films which are proposed to be sent?

Shri Buragohain: The three documentaries are: "Kumaon Hills" technicolour; "The Great Experiment"—documentary on the General Elections; "New Lands for Old"—about soil erosion in Damodar Valley. The feature film is entitled "Awara".

JUTE SUPPLIES BY PAKISTAN

*1533. **Shri Ramachandra Reddi:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) at what rate jute is proposed to be supplied by Pakistan to India;

(b) how that rate compares with the existing cost of jute in India; and

(c) what the effect of the said agreement will be on jute cultivation in India?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). No price has been fixed by Government for jute supplies by Pakistan.

(c) The hon. Member's attention is invited to my reply to the half-hour discussion on raw jute initiated by Shri B. K. Das on the 1st of April 1953.

Shri T. N. Singh: Is it suggested that there is no Government to Government trade in jute so far as supply of Pakistan jute is concerned?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is correct, Sir.

MATCH BOXES AND MATCH STICKS

*1534. **Shri Jhulan Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state whether the entire requirement of the country in match boxes and match sticks is met by local production?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): Yes, Sir.

Shri Jhulan Sinha: May I know if there is any surplus exportable to other countries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir. In 1951-52 about 309 cases were exported. During the nine months of 1952-53, 540 cases were exported.

Shri Nanadas: May I know, Sir, the countries that import our matchwood?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I would like to have notice.

Shri K. G. Deshmukh: What is the quantity of indigenous production of these match boxes?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I think this information was given previously. In 1952 it was 607,672 cases, and in previous years it was less:

1951	575,000
1950	... 523,000

Shri S. V. Ramaswamy: Is the Western India Match Co. a foreign firm, and is it this company which is producing the greater proportion of the production of this country?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: My hon. friend goes into fundamentals. It is not an entirely foreign firm. There is a fairly large element of Indian capital, but it is also a fact that it produces the major portion of the matches that are consumed in this country.

Shri G. P. Sinha: May I know whether we import any of the raw materials for manufacture of matches?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Quite a lot.

Shri Muniswamy: May I know whether the Government have received any representations from match factory owners of Tamil Nad about their difficulties, and what steps have been taken?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Yes, Sir. Practically week after week we get representations.

Shri Muniswamy: I want to know what steps have been taken.

COMPENSATION TO NAGAS OF NOKHU VILLAGE

*1535. **Shri Rishang Keishing:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to refer to the reply to starred question No. 692 asked on the 11th March, 1953 and state

(a) whether the Government of Burma have worked out the details for payment of compensation to the relatives of the persons killed in the raid on Nokhu village;

(b) if so, what amount and when it will be paid; and

(c) if not, the reason therefor?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) to (c). Details are being worked out, but have not been finalised yet.

Shri Rishang Keishing: Is it a fact that the Burmese Chief of Ponnyo village met the Prime Ministers of India and Burma during their Indo-Burmese frontier tour, and promised before them never to head-hunt again?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Yes, Sir. The Naga Chief is reported to have met our Prime Minister and the Burmese Prime Minister and given them a sort of gentleman's undertaking that he would not go head-hunting again.

Shri Rishang Keishing: Is it also a fact, Sir, that the Chief of Ponnyo village promised to pay compensation in kind worth Rs. 15,000 to the Indian Nagas?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: No specific sum was mentioned, but there was some sort of understanding that they would pay some compensation to the people concerned.

Shri Rishang Keishing: Was this a subject matter of discussion between the two Prime Ministers during their Indo-Burma frontier tour?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: It does not arise out of this question.

SALT

*1537. **Shri L. J. Singh**: Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) the quantity of salt exported, if any, in 1951-52 and 1952-53; and

(b) the development schemes which Government propose to carry out for expansion and improvement of salt wells in different parts of India?

The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Production (Shri R. G. Dubey): (a) 79,000 tons of salt were exported in 1951-52 and 2,52,000 tons in 1952-53.

(b) Most of our salt is manufactured from sea water or lake brine, and only about 8 per cent. from salt wells fed by sub-soil brine. These wells are situated mostly at the Government of India's works at Kharaghoda in the Rann of Kutch, in Bombay State. There are also some private producers manufacturing salt from wells in Saurashtra State, in the vicinity of Kharaghoda. No special schemes have been drawn up for expansion or improvement of these wells, as their present production is already ample for the markets which they feed, except that it is proposed to carry out trial boring at Kharaghoda, to locate fresh areas of good brine supply.

Shri L. J. Singh: May I know, Sir, what are the names of the importing countries?

Shri R. G. Dubey: Salt was exported to Japan, Maladive Islands, Eastern Pakistan and Nepal.

Shri L. J. Singh: Is it a fact that there has been a growing demand for Sambhar Lake Salt, and if so, what are the measures taken to improve its production?

Shri R. G. Dubey: Yes. Government are trying to have tube-wells, and improve the supply of good brine.

Shri L. J. Singh: Are Government aware that there are a number of salt wells in Manipur, and if so, what are the measures taken to improve them?

Shri R. G. Dubey: I would like to have notice.

CONFERENCE OF DEVELOPMENT COMMISSIONERS

*1538. **Shri L. J. Singh**: Will the Minister of **Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a conference of the Development Commissioners from all States, representing 81 development blocks in which the Community Project Work started on the 2nd October, 1952 was held in Delhi from the 16th to 19th April, 1953; and

(b) if so, whether Government propose to lay on the Table of the House the decisions arrived at in the conference?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) A list of recommendations will be laid on the Table.

Shri L. J. Singh: I have not got the copy of the recommendations. It has not been laid on the Table of the House.

Shri Hathi: A list of the recommendations will be laid on the Table of the House.

Shri L. J. Singh: May I know whether all the various national days will be observed in the community project areas?

Shri Hathi: That was one of the suggestions.

Shri L. J. Singh: Is it a fact that a suggestion was made for awarding prizes for the outstanding works?

Shri Hathi: That also was one of the questions discussed.

Shri Nanadas: May I know whether any community project is likely to be completed in the year 1953?

Shri Hathi: It is not intended to be completed in 1953.

Shri T. N. Singh: May I know whether at this Conference of Development Commissioners, there was a shift in emphasis on extension schemes as against community projects?

Shri Hathi: That question was also discussed.

SHIPS BUILT IN INDIA

*1539. **Shri Jethalal Joshi:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) how many ships have been built in India in the year 1951-52;

(b) the total tonnage of these ships; and

(c) the total cost of the ships?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) to (c). Though during the calendar years 1951 and 1952 six ships were completed, during the financial year 1951-52 only one ship of 8,000 D.W.T. was completed at a cost of Rs. 62·92 lakhs.

Shri Jethalal Joshi: May I know whether Government have given any subsidy for this purpose?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Yes, Government are giving subsidies towards the sale of these ships.

Shri Jethalal Joshi: Are the Government aware that the foreign ships loading at the Calcutta port sail almost with full loads of cargo, while Indian ships plying on overseas trade, rarely get cargo from the same port?

Shri K. C. Reddy: I submit that that question does not arise out of this.

Shri Altekar: May I know whether the ship-building industry is worked to its fullest extent?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Yes, every attempt is being made in that direction, but during the last year owing to some deficiency in the supply of steel in required quantities, there was a slowdown.

Shrimati A. Kale: Is it a fact that the Government are sustaining a huge amount of loss on building ships in India?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Government are paying subsidy towards the sale of these ships, and as I have already indicated, every attempt is being made to bring down the cost of construction of ships, and to avoid the payment of subsidy.

Shrimati A. Kale: My question has not been answered.

Shri Matthen: How does the cost per ship in India compare with the cost of a similar ship in the United Kingdom?

Shri K. C. Reddy: It varies from time to time. I cannot give the figures now. If the hon. Member puts down a question in respect of any particular ship, I shall be prepared to answer.

कोयले की खानों में फालतू मजदूर

*१५४०. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : क्या उत्पादन मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि सरकार द्वारा संचालित कोयले की खानों में ४१००० मजदूर, जिनकी अब औद्योगिक अधिकरण द्वारा छंटनी कर दिये जाने की आज्ञा दी गई है, पहले किन परिस्थितियों में अधिक रख लिये गये थे ?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): The number of surplus workers proposed to be retrenched from the State Railway Collieries is about four thousand one hundred and not 41 thousand as stated in the question.

The main factor contributing to the existence of surplus labour in the Railway Collieries has been the dwindling number of working faces, especially in the Giridih Collieries, due to the gradual exhaustion of the working seam.

For detailed information the attention of the hon. Member is invited to Chapters V and VI of the Report of the Railway Collieries Inquiry Committee, a copy of which is available in the Library of the House.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Are the Government arranging to re-employ these men?

Shri K. C. Reddy: Yes, every attempt will be made to provide employment for the retrenched men, but it cannot be said definitely as to how many of these can be absorbed elsewhere.

Shri T. N. Singh: There was a proposal about three years ago, to rationalise the industry as also to bring more machinery for these railway collieries, which may have resulted in the re-employment of these people. Has the machinery been brought?

Shri K. C. Reddy: So far as I know, the mechanisation of the mines has not been the main factor in determining the number of surplus workmen. It will take me a long time to give all the reasons. That is why I have invited the hon. Member's attention to the Report of the Railway Collieries Inquiry Committee.

Pandit D. N. Tiwary: How many of these men have been re-employed, and how many are still unemployed?

Shri K. C. Reddy: The retrenchment has not yet taken place. It is to take place at a future date.

SUPPLY OF COAL TO EGYPT

*1542. **Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha:** Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Egypt have approached the Government of India, for supplying coal to Egypt;

(b) if so, whether Government have agreed to their request; and

(c) if the answer to part (b) above be in the affirmative, what will be the total amount of coal to be supplied to them in 1953?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) No.

(b) and (c). Do not arise.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: May I know whether the Government are aware of the different reports appearing in the papers that the Government of Egypt have applied for coal, to the Government of India?

Shri K. C. Reddy: No. The Government of Egypt has not applied to the Government of India. The fact is that certain firms have approached the Government of India to give them facilities to export coal to Egypt. That matter is under consideration.

INDIA-AMERICA WEEK CELEBRATIONS

*1543. **Shri Buchhikotaiah:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any India-America week celebrations were conducted recently in New York; and

(b) what were the main functions in the celebrations?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) Yes.

(b) There were speeches and panel discussions on Indian philosophy and literature; demonstrations of Indian dancing; exhibition of Indian documentary films, including one on Mahatma Gandhi; and an exhibition of Indian paintings and other objects of art.

Shri Buchhikotaiah: When was this Indo-American cultural celebration started?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: It was a sort of cultural convention to bring to the notice of the public there the importance of cultural contacts for true understanding of the deeper currents of Indian life.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know when it was started.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: It was from the 6th to the 11th April this year.

Shri Buchhikotaiah: May I know how many times these cultural celebrations take place in one year?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: There is no fixed rule about it.

Shri Nanadas: May I know whether this kind of celebration has been celebrated in any other country?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: I am afraid, I cannot give the answer now.

Mr. Speaker: He wants notice.

Prof. D. C. Sharma: There was an editorial in one of the leading American papers that the art, literature and culture of India were very foreign to the Americans. Of course, they understood Indian dancing. May I know what further efforts the Government of India are making to make the public of U.S.A. understand our culture?

Shri K. K. Basu: In view of the fact that the celebration coincided with our national week, may I know whether any pictures depicting the principal national movement were shown?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: Several documentaries were shown, and there was one on Gandhiji's life.

Mr. Speaker: He specifically refers to the Indian struggle for independence. He wants to know whether any films of that kind were shown.

Shri Anil K. Chanda: There was one on Mahatma Gandhi's life.

TRADE MISSION TO AUSTRALIA

***1544. Shri Buchhikotaiah:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether any Trade Mission was sent to Australia in order to expand the marketing of Jute goods in that country;

(b) when was that Mission sent; and

(c) who were the members?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) Yes.

(b) 16th April, 1953.

(c) The Delegation is led by Shri L. K. Jha, Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and includes the following representatives of the Indian Jute Mills Association, Calcutta:—

1. Mr. J. G. Walton.

2. Mr. D. P. Goenka.

Shri Buchhikotaiah: May I know how many such agreements were signed, and with which countries?

Mr. Speaker: I think it is too wide a question. It does not arise out of this.

Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha: Australia was an important market for Indian jute. What were the reasons why the export to Australia declined by 50 per cent.?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: For one thing, Australia was in difficulties in regard to her foreign exchange, and she drastically cut down her imports. Secondly, they took to bulk handling, which means a very heavy cut in their consumption of jute goods.

Shri L. N. Mishra: May I know, Sir, whether this delegation has been sent at the cost of the Indian Jute Mills' Association or at the cost of the Government of India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: So far as the Government of India's representative is concerned, their expenditure would be to the account of the Central Government exchequer. So far as the others are concerned, they will find their own money for their expenses.

Shri S. N. Das: May I know, Sir, whether any interim report has been submitted by the Mission?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I just heard, Sir, that the delegation has reached Sydney.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: May I know, Sir, whether this delegation would explore the possibilities of coir export from India?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: No, Sir. They are only going for jute, not for coir.

Shri B. K. Das: May I know, Sir, whether this Mission will visit any other country?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Only Australia.

Shri Nanadas and **Shri G. P. Sinha** *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Let us go to the next question.

COTTAGE INDUSTRY EXPERIMENTAL UNITS

***1545. Shri M. R. Krishna:** (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the number of cottage industry experimental units started by the Central Government?

(b) Where are these centres located and when have they been started?

(c) What is the annual expenditure incurred on each of these Centres?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). So far as the Ministry of Commerce and Industry is concerned, only one experimental Unit was started in 1950 at Harduaganj and that has since been closed down.

(c) In view of above the information is nil.

2. Information in respect of similar units, under the Ministries of Rehabilitation and Food and Agriculture, is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Shri M. R. Krishna: May I know, Sir, the reasons that led to the closing of the centre which was started first?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It was found, Sir, that the institution was not serving any useful purpose.

Shri Nanadas: May I know, Sir, whether Government is contemplating to start new centres?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Sir, Government have under consideration several proposals in regard to helping small scale industries. It may be, Sir, when the proposals mature, it will be necessary for us either to start new

centres on our own or do it in collaboration with other Ministries or do it in collaboration with the States.

Shri B. S. Murthy: May I know, Sir, whether such centres started by the Rehabilitation and Food Ministries are working satisfactorily?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I am unable to give any information, Sir. That question must be put to the Minister concerned.

Shri M. R. Krishna: May I know, Sir, whether any foreign nationals are working in any of these experimental centres?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Since there are no experimental centres now in existence, Sir, there is no case of foreign nationals working there.

Shri Balakrishnan: May I know whether any financial aid is given to newcomers in cottage industries?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That is a different question altogether. It has no concern with experimental centres.

Shri S. C. Samanta: May I know, Sir, the names of cottage industries that were taken under this experimental scheme and the reasons for the failure of the scheme?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is a long story, Sir. If the hon. Member will put down a question, I shall give him the details. The reason really was the lack of co-ordination between the unit and people concerned. In fact, it had a very chequered history. There had been a lot of opposition to this institution and ultimately we found that we were merely spending the tax-payers' money by keeping the institution going. If it is at all revived, it must be revived in a different form.

Pegging of Coal

***1546. Dr. Hari Mohan:** (a) Will the Minister of **Production** be pleased to state the reasons for issue of the recent order for pegging Grade I and Grade II low volatile coal?

(b) Is such coal economically suitable for metallurgical purpose either by blending or by washing?

(c) Is it a fact that domestic coke is manufactured mostly out of Grade II coal and pegging of such coal would affect the interests of public consumers?

(d) Are Government aware that pegging of such coal might affect coal out-put in near future?

The Minister of Production (Shri K. C. Reddy): (a) There were two main reasons. Firstly the reserves of Grade I and Grade II low volatile coking coal are limited. Secondly, the selected Grade collieries whose out-put alone was "pegged" in the first instance, were prohibited from increasing their production of Grade I and Grade II low volatile coal to make up for the reduction in their selected Grades A and B coal. This operated as discrimination against such collieries, as collieries producing only Grade I and Grade II low volatile coal were free to increase their out-put without any limit. Government therefore considered it desirable to treat all such collieries on the same basis.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) Domestic coke is manufactured mostly out of Grade II and Grade III coal. The pegging of Grade II low volatile coal will not affect the interests of public consumers, as the limit fixed is the same as the 1952 level of production, which was ample for the purpose.

(d) No, it will not affect coal out-put, as the intention is to offset the reduction in the production of low volatile coal by an increase in the production of non-metallurgical coal.

Dr. Hari Mohan: May I know, Sir, if the output of Grades I and II coal in the railway collieries—the figures for—is going to be pegged on the same principle i.e. on the figures of 1952.

Shri K. C. Reddy: I did not follow the question.

Mr. Speaker: I think he wants to know the output in the railway collieries of Grade I and II coal in the year 1952.

Shri K. C. Reddy: Railway Collieries? I am sorry I have not got the figures here. I should like to have notice.

Shri Ramananda Das: May I know whether this pegging of coal has caused unemployment to the coalminers?

Shri K. C. Reddy: No, Sir. We are taking care to see that this pegging policy does not bring about any serious dislocation of labour.

Re-entry of Indians into Ceylon

***1547. Shri Thanu Pillai:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) the number of Indians, normally resident in Ceylon, who have been refused re-entry into Ceylon since the passing of the Indian and Pakistani

Citizenship Act by the Government of Ceylon; and

(b) what action has been taken by our Government to get visa for these people or to rehabilitate them in India?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) Entry and re-entry of Indians into Ceylon is governed by the provisions of Immigrants and Emigrants Act. The number of Indians whom permits for re-entry into Ceylon have been refused since the operation of this Act, is not known. The information has, however, been called for from Indian High Commissioner in Ceylon and will be placed on the Table of the House when received.

(b) The Indian High Commissioner in Ceylon has been taking up individual cases of hardship *ad hoc* with the authorities in Ceylon. The question of rehabilitation of these people in India does not arise.

Shri Thanu Pillai: May I know, Sir, how many such people have been helped by the Indian High Commissioner in Ceylon?

Shri Anil K. Chanda: We have not got the exact number, but special cases of hardship are taken up by the High Commission there with the Government of Ceylon.

Shri Thanu Pillai: May I know why in the answer to (b), the question of rehabilitation does not arise? These people are displaced and have come here and there is nobody to help them.

Mr. Speaker: He wants to know why the question of rehabilitation of these people does not arise. When Indians in Ceylon are not permitted to stay and carry on their business there, they must necessarily return to India and the question of rehabilitation does arise. That seems to be his argument.

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): It is not quite clear whether reference is being made to persons who are Indian nationals, or to people of Indian descent in Ceylon who are presumed to be Ceylon nationals. In regard to the latter the Indian High Commission there is concerned only in so far as we are interested in settling the problem with the goodwill of the Ceylon Government.

Shri Thanu Pillai: My reference is to Indians who have decided to continue to be Indian citizens and who are normally resident in Ceylon and are not able to go back to Ceylon for employment.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: These are matters to be dealt with diplomatically. A country can admit a person or refuse entry. If it is done unfairly, then diplomatic representations are made.

Shri Thanu Pillai: My question is with reference to (b). Indian nationals who have decided to continue to be Indian nationals here and normally continue to do some work in Ceylon having been refused entry in Ceylon, have no employment here. I am asking what arrangements could be made for these people—for rehabilitating them?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: In India?

Shri Thanu Pillai: Yes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Apart from trying to help, I do not see why Government should take responsibility for every person who comes to India in that way.

Shri Thanu Pillai: It is because of the disabilities placed.....

Mr. Speaker: We are arguing the question. The answer is very clear.

उच्चतम न्यायालय के लिये इमारत

*१५४८. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :** (क) क्या निर्माण, गृह-व्यवस्था तथा रसद मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि उच्चतम न्यायालय की प्रस्तावित इमारत का नक्शा किस संस्था या व्यक्ति ने तैयार किया है ।

(ख) यह इमारत किस प्रकार की होगी और क्या उस में भारतीय वास्तु-कला की झलक होगी ?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Shri G. B. Deolalikar, the then Chief Architect, Central Public Works Department.

(b) The style, I understand, is what is known as "Indo-Saracenic", and it will therefore bear the influence of the Indian style.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : इस इमारत पर कितना खर्च होगा ?

Sardar Swaran Singh: About 49 lakhs.

Shri Nanadas: May I know, Sir, whether it was decided to house the Supreme Court permanently in Delhi and when was it decided and by whom?

Sardar Swaran Singh: It was, Sir, decided by the Government some years ago and the decision was taken after consideration of all the aspects.

Several Hon. Members *rose*—

Mr. Speaker: Let us go to the next question. There is no time.

खोपरा और नारियल के तेल का आयात

*१५४९. **श्री रघुनाथ सिंह:** क्या वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे :

(क) क्या भारतीय केन्द्रीय नारियल समिति ने सरकार को सुझाव दिया है कि १९५३-५४ में केवल ५०,००० टन खोपरा तथा नारियलके तेल का भारत में आयात किया जाय ; तथा

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार ने इस सुझाव को स्वीकार कर लिया है ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) No, Sir. No communication nas been received to this effect by the Ministry of Commerce and Industry.

(b) Does not arise.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Boundary Line between India and Burma

*1528. **Shri B. N. Roy:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the boundary line between India and Burma is going to be fixed; and

(b) whether there is any other place also on the Indian frontiers where the boundary has not yet been decided?

The Deputy Minister of External Affairs (Shri Anil K. Chanda): (a) The matter is under consideration.

(b) The question of "deciding" the international boundary does not arise as it is well-known by convention, usage and custom.

Licences for Import of Automobile Engines

*1541. **Shri Venkataraman:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) whether licence for the import of automobile engines and vehicles has been granted to the Bombay State Government for the period January—June, 1953;

(b) the quantity of each item allowed to be imported and the total value thereof;

(c) whether these engines are assembled and available in India; and

(d) if so, the reasons for the grant of import license?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 6.]

(c) Perkins engines are being assembled in India.

(d) The import of Perkins engines was allowed as a part of the Canadian Aid offered to India under the Colombo Plan. This was allowed before proposals were submitted to Government for assembly of such engines in India.

Besides it is understood that the prices charged for engines assembled in India are higher than the prices of engines imported in an assembled condition.

Selection of Economic Investigators

1170. **Shri Nanadas:** Will the Minister **of Planning** be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Union Public Service Commission have completed the selection of two posts of Economic Investigators (Grade I) for Community Projects Administration as advertised in August, 1952;

(b) the total number of applications received and the number received from candidates belonging to Scheduled Castes and Tribes;

(c) how many candidates were called for interview and how many were selected; and

(d) whether any Scheduled Castes candidates were selected?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Yes.

(b) and (c). The matter is under correspondence with the Union Public Service Commission.

(d) No.

GANDHI MEMORIAL IN U. S. A.

1171. **Shri Bheekha Bhai:** Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a six-acre tract has been allotted to the Indian Ambassador in America by the U.S.A. Government for the Gandhi Memorial site;

(b) if so, whether the site allotted is a free gift or otherwise;

(c) whether the Government of U.S.A. will give any financial assistance for raising the Gandhi Memorial; and

(d) what steps Government propose to take in raising the Gandhi Memorial?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) No land has been allotted to the Indian Ambassador in Washington. The Government of India understand, however, that there is a proposal for the allotment of five acres of land to the India League of America for the Gandhi Memorial site.

(b) So far as Government are aware, a free gift of this land is proposed.

(c) Government have no information.

(d) Government are not concerned with this directly. The memorial is being sponsored by the India League of America. No request for assistance has been made to the Government of India.

काफ़ी तथा काफी से बनी वस्तुएं (आयात)

११७२. श्री बलवन्त सिन्हा मेहता : क्या वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) वर्ष १९५१-५२ तथा १९५२-५३ में कितनी मात्रा मे काफी तथा काफी से बनी वस्तुएं विदेशों से भारत आई तथा उनका मूल्य क्या था ;

(ख) उक्त आयात करने देने का क्या कारण है ; तथा

(ग) क्या सरकार काफी के आयात पर किसी प्रकार के प्रतिबन्ध लगान का विचार कर रही है ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) and (b). No import took place in 1951-52. During the first eleven months of 1952-53, 2 cwts. of coffee (other than roasted or ground) valued at Rs. 1,000 were imported for experimental purposes by the Director of Agriculture, Madras.

(c) Does not arise as import is banned.

UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS OF GOVERNMENT QUARTERS

1173. **Shri Bahadur Singh:** (a) Will the Minister of **Works, Housing and Supply** be pleased to state what was the number of unauthorised occupants of Government residences who were evicted under the Requisitioning and Acquisitioning Act, 1952, during the year 1952?

(b) What is the total number of houses which were still in unauthorised occupation on the 31st January, 1953?

(c) Was any amount due in respect of arrears or damages for the period prior to 1st August, 1948 waived?

The Minister of Works, Housing and Supply (Sardar Swaran Singh): (a) Eviction of unauthorised occupants of Government residences is carried out under the Government Premises (Eviction) Act 1950 and not under the Requisitioning and Acquisition of Immovable Property Act, 1533 families of unauthorised occupants of Government residences in Delhi/New Delhi were evicted under the former Act during the year 1952.

(b) 262.

(c) Yes, Sir. Since the 15th of August 1947 upto 31st July 1948, a sum of Rs. 3,66,103 which became due from displaced persons in unauthorized occupation of Government accommodation was waived after examining cases of special hardship.

PROFITS OF INDUSTRIES

1174. **Shri K. K. Basu:** Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state:

(a) the annual profit (both gross and nett) made by the Cotton Textile, Sugar, Cement, Tea, Jute, coal mines industries during the post-war years since 1945-46;

(b) the amount allocated industry-wise to depreciation and reserve funds during these years; and

(c) the average rate of dividend declared during the same years?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) to (c). Three statements giving information that is available are laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 7.]

RE-ORGANISATION OF ASSAM RIFLES

1175. Shri Gohain: Will the **Prime Minister** be pleased to state whether the re-organisation of Assam Rifles will be completed next year?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Yes.

STATUTORY BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND COMMITTEES

1176. Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the purposes of each Statutory Board, Commission and Committee constituted under his Ministry?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* **Appendix X**, annexure No. 8.]

ALL-INDIA HANDICRAFTS BOARD

1177. Shri M. L. Agrawal: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the number of persons employed by the All-India Handicrafts Board for the discharge of its functions and responsibilities?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): A statement is laid on the Table of the House. [*See* Appendix X, annexure No. 9.]

ALL-INDIA HANDICRAFTS BOARD

1178. Shri M. L. Agrawal: (a) Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the qualifications and practical experience in manufacturing cottage industry products of the members of the All-India Handicrafts Board constituted under the Ministry of Commerce and Industry's Resolution No. 51-Cot.-Ind.(1)/52, dated the 5th November, 1952?

(b) Does the Handicrafts Board enjoy executive powers like the All-India Khadi and Village Industries Board constituted by the Government Resolution No. 45-Cot.-Ind.(5)/52, dated the 14th January, 1953?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) In the opinion of Government, the members chosen to serve on the All-India Handicrafts Board are persons suitable to discharge the functions entrusted to the members of the Board.

(b) The powers of the Handicrafts Board and the Khadi and Village Industries Board are primarily advisory. But as a rule whenever Government differs from the views of the Boards, the subjects on which they differ are discussed with the respective Boards.

FOREIGN MEDICINES

1179. Prof. D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of **Commerce and Industry** be pleased to state the value of foreign medicines imported into India in 1952?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): About Rs. 13 crores.

क्रोम चमड़ा बनाने के केन्द्र

११८०. श्री बादशाह गुप्त : क्या वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि भारत में क्रोम चमड़ा बनाने के मुख्य केन्द्र कहां कहां हैं ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): The principal chrome leather manufacturing centres in India are Calcutta, Kanpur and Madras.

ब्रिटिश उपनिवेशों में भारतीय

११८१. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : (क) क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि भिन्न भिन्न ब्रिटिश उपनिवेशों में कितने भारतीय आबाद हैं ?

(ख) उन्हें उन उपनिवेशों में नागरिकता के पूर्ण अधिकार प्राप्त हैं अथवा नहीं ?

The Prime Minister (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): (a) The number of Indians settled in various British colonies so far as it is available, is as under:—

Aden		9,456
Brunei	..	436
British North Borneo	..	1,298
British Somaliland	..	550
British Guiana	..	190,880

Cyprus	..	40
Fiji	..	148,802
Gibralter	..	41
Gold Coast	..	250
Hong Kong	..	1,500
Jamaica	..	25,000
Kenya	..	90,528
Malaya	..	577,000
Malta	..	37
Mauritius	..	271,636
Nigeria	..	50
Northern Rhodesia	..	2,600
Nyasaland	..	4,000
Sarawak	..	2,300
Sierra Leone	..	50
Singapore	..	72,000
Southern Rhodesia	..	4,150
Tanganyika	..	56,499
Uganda	..	33,767
Zanzibar and Pemba	..	15,812
British West Indies	..	227,039

(b) Government have no information on this point. Having resided for long and acquired interests in these colonies, Indians are eligible to become United Kingdom and colonies citizens.

As regards Malaya, the Government of that colony have enacted their own citizenship Regulations, which came into force from 15th September, 1952. The total number of Indians who acquired Malayan citizenship rights upto 31st August, 1952, is estimated to be 200,000.

मिश्र में भारतीय चाय बाजार

११८२. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : (क) वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या लंका से मिश्र को चाय का निर्यात होने के कारण भारतीय चाय बाजार पर, विशेष रूप से मिश्र में, बुरा प्रभाव पड़ा है ?

(ख) वर्ष १९५१-५२ में मिश्र में कितनी भारतीय तथा लंका की चाय का आयात किया गया ?

(ग) जनवरी से मार्च १९५३ तक की अवधि में मिश्र में कितनी भारतीय तथा लंका की चाय का आयात किया गया ?

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): (a) If the presumption behind the question is that India's export of tea to Egypt has been already affected by competition from Ceylon the answer is in the negative.

(b) —

('000 lbs.)

	India	Ceylon
1951	4,043	23,648
1952	4,225	25,653

(c) The figures are being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

रेडियो व्यापारी संघ द्वारा दिये गये सुझाव

११८३. श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : (क) सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्री यह बतलाने की कृपा करेंगे कि क्या सरकार को ज्ञात है कि अखिल भारतीय रेडियो व्यापारी संघ की ९ अप्रैल, १९५३ को दिल्ली में हुई एक सभा में भारतीय प्रसारण को अधिक लोकप्रिय बनाने के लिये कितने ही सुझाव रखे गये थे ?

(ख) यदि हां, तो क्या सरकार इन सुझावों पर विचार करेगी ?

The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar): (a) Yes, Sir, through Press reports.

(b) Some of the suggestions had already been considered by Government and were found to be unacceptable.

THE

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES

Dated 25.11.2014

(Part II—Proceedings other than Questions and Answers)

OFFICIAL REPORT

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE

Wednesday, 22nd April, 1953

The House met at a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

(See Part I)

9-15 A.M

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the hon. Members that Sardar Jogendra Singh, M.P. completed 63 days of continuous absence on the 20th April, 1953, and thereafter attended the sitting of the House on the 21st April, 1953. He has now sent an application for leave of absence which reads as follows:

> "I beg leave through you to request the Honourable House of the Pople to condone my absence from the House for a period of sixty-three days. The reason for this continuous absence was my ill health. I hope that the House will condone this unavoidable absence."

Is it the pleasure of the House that the absence of Sardar Jogendra Singh for 63 days from the 17th February to the 20th April, 1953, be condoned, as requested by him in his letter?

Absence was condoned.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): On a point of information, Sir. If the hon. Member was sick why did he not send the application earlier?

Mr. Speaker: It is a very minor matter. Now that the point has been raised, in future Members will bear

this in mind that the point is likely to be raised in the House. I do not think we will go into details.

INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Minister of Commerce and Industry (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to move:

> "That the Bill to amend the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri N. V. Gadgil, Prof. Diwan Chand Sharma, Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta, Shri Govind Hari Deshpande, Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi, Shri Upendranath Barman, Dr. Jayantilal Narbheram Parekh, Shri Abdus Sattar, Shri S. C. Deb, Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra, Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad', Shri Radhelal Vyas, Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shri K. G. Deshmukh, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao Diwan, Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha, Shri G. R. Damodaran, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh, Shri Shri Chand Singhal, Shri Baij Nath Kureel, Shri Chaturbhuj V. Jasani, Shri Vishwambhar Dayal Tripathi, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri Durga Charan Banerjee, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri Kamal Kumar Basu, Shri G. D. Somani, Dr. Indubhai B. Amin, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri Choithram P. Gidwani, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri B. Rajagopala Rao, and the Mover, with instructions to report by the 29th April, 1953"

I would like to say at the outset that this measure which was passed in 1951, after a certain amount of controversy, heat and discussion which it generated during its passage through the House, has been worked now for nearly a year. The first evidence of

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

its commencing work was the constitution of the Industries Advisory Council. The Council met, for the first time, in May 1952 and it had two meetings. The Council constituted a Sub-committee in order to scrutinise the licences given. That sub-committee met once.

The other aspect of the measure, namely, granting licences of registration for undertakings has been going on fairly smoothly. I have given in this House information as to the extent of the work that has been done in this regard. In fact the Government found that industries were rather anxious to get registered, even though, under the Act, they need not do so, so much so that a large number of applications which had been received had to be turned down because Government were not competent to register those undertakings.

Another aspect of this measure was the constitution of the Development Councils. It was originally suggested that we should constitute six councils. The working of these Councils had to be studied as they obtained in other countries. We were fortunate enough in getting an expert who was familiar with the working of such Councils in the United Kingdom; and he had done a certain amount of preliminary work and told the Government how to proceed with these Development Councils. At the same time, in view of the fact that in the parent country where this started, the Development Councils had a chequered history, I, on my own responsibility, felt Government should go rather carefully in this matter. We have constituted two Development Councils, one in regard to Diesel engines and the other in regard to fertilisers. I am happy to say that with the co-operation of an hon. Member of this House, who is the Chairman of the Diesel engines Council, the first sitting was held two days back. The Fertiliser Development Council will meet very soon. It is the intention of Government to watch for some time the working of these Councils before we proceed further in regard to the constitution of other Development Councils.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Certain difficulties arose in the working of this Act, which I shall mention presently. Not the least among the difficulties which faced us was in regard to the provisions of the Act viz., sections 15, 16 and 17. Section 15 gave the Government powers to investigate into any industry for certain reasons. The reasons that were stated were rather circumscribed largely and dictated by the fears of the industries that as the Government's rights to investigate into the industries had a wide scope, there will be endless interference.

Since I took charge of this Ministry, I have been at pains to assure the industry that it is not the intention of Government to work this measure from a punitive aspect but largely from the developmental aspect. It often happens that in industries badly run, people who are not in that industry but connected with that particular unit generally feel it is badly run and feel that Government ought to help to set matters right. Nevertheless we find that the powers vested in the Government under sections 15, 16 and 17 are very inadequate. In fact the powers given to Government to investigate into the conditions of any industry happen to be not very wide. Searching questions are put in this House by hon. Members why in a particular industry production has dropped and why it is not working. It may be that under the present framing of section 15, certain powers are given, but they are not wide enough. Then again, it lays down a certain procedure where in an emergent situation Government is unable to act. We have first to investigate, then we have to give directions to a particular industry based on the results of that investigation and thereafter, if those directions are not obeyed, Government can take over that industry and run it. This procedure entails a period of months and when taking over the industry, no procedure has been devised as to how Government could run it. The interests of private parties are there. The interests of shareholders, the interests of managing agents and their rights arising out of contracts are all there, and in the circumstances it is very difficult for Government to take over an industry and run it even for the purpose of bettering the industry or in the interests of the general economy of the country.

Hon. Members of this House might very well ask: what experiments have you made in this direction, and why do you feel that these powers have to be amended now? I can mention only one instance, in which the Government gave notice under section 15. It happens to be a textile mill in Indore. But I do not mind admitting that when giving notice to a particular unit, Government have to look at the entire

picture and the consequences that will flow from giving notice, because once an investigation is made and we give directions and they are not obeyed, we should be prepared to take over and run the industry, and that limits the scope of Government's action under section 15. There is no point in taking over an industry which, obviously, is uneconomic and which could not be run, and where Government will have to invest a large amount of money, and in doing so, the financial position of Government is extremely insecure so far as the legal aspect of it is concerned. So, we can only give notice in regard to those industries where we feel sure that the industry is a sound but it is being badly run, and we also feel sure of the inevitable consequence that flow therefrom, then Government would have to take over the industry and we—whether it be the State Government or ourselves—would be able to run the industry. That is why perhaps we gave notice to only one unit, and as it happened, the unit was a sound one. The proprietors felt that they should not measure their strength in this regard with the Government and the mill was reopened. All these experiences during the last eleven months have demonstrated to us very clearly that certain amendments have to be undertaken.

Many hon. Members of this House who have been here before and who know all about the old Act would certainly sympathise with Government in their present attempt because hon. Ministers who preceded me in this high office—I am referring to Dr. S. P. Mookerjee and Shri H. K. Mahtab—had given such close attention to this particular measure and I know that I am now coming back to the circle right up to the end practically where my hon. friend Dr. S. P. Mookerjee began, and the attempts were whittled down merely because we had to accommodate various interests. We now find that the limited powers that Government wants in order to make this particular measure a success in its working are those that are now mentioned in the amending Bill before the House.

I would like to say that I am happy that I have not raised a veritable hornets' nest by introducing this measure. In fact, I am flatter myself that the public and even the vested interests have been treating me a little more gently than they treated my hon. predecessor in this office, Dr. S. P. Mookerjee. We have received only three protests: one from the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry and two others from two members of the Industries Advisory Council. Naturally, the Federation has to protest fairly vehemently, and the two private members who have sent in their protests have worded them very cautiously and I am very happy that in voicing their protests they mentioned the fact that there is an atmosphere today when the people feel and the country feels that Government would not take any hasty action which would deter the progress of industry and the increase in production which is now more or less the order of the day, luckily. That is a certificate which perhaps hon. Members here will say we ought not to seek, but that is an appraisal of present conditions which I certainly welcome, and I would like to say at once that it is my intention—and I think it is Government's intention as well—that we do not wish to disturb the equanimity that now exists in the minds of people who are concerned that there will be no violent upheaval, and I would once again like to reiterate the assurance that I have given in the past, that Government would not needlessly interfere in the industrial process. For one thing, we have not got the necessary personnel, and besides there is no meaning in Government going and interfering with a unit which just goes on producing well; where production is going up, where labour is being treated well, and where the relations between employers and labour happen to be cordial. It is just crazy for any Member of the Government to go and interfere in an industry of that nature. So I would once again say that it is not our intention by this amendment to augment our powers, so that my hand might be extended and I might catch by the scarf of the neck those people who protest against Government's policy here and there and with whom assuredly we are not popular. Our intention is not either to use political power or the power of Government even to change the structure of things in any violent way. It is only progressively to improve the economy of the country and attain the objectives that a welfare State has in mind.

In this connection, I would like to read from that magazine devoted to industry, namely, commerce, which I would not say is particularly favourable to governmental policies where they affect industries and commerce, because it feels that we are rather influenced, may I say, largely by our socialist friends. Even this magazine during the course of an article which is not altogether an appreciative one, appearing in its issue dated

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

the 18th April, says:

> "Be that as it may, the new clause in the Bill vesting in the Central Government the power to assume management and control of recalcitrant industrial undertakings is intended to remove a lacuna in the present law. In the absence of legal provisions, Government is facing two difficulties. These are: (1) inability of the Government to take over managements even in a situation calling for emergent action without first issuing directions to it and waiting to see whether or not they are obeyed; and (2) want of details of the existing law with regard to the consequences of the Government taking over the management."

That, I think, covers more or less the main provisions of this amending Bill. As I said, it shows an understanding of the position which is extremely happy, so far as I am concerned. Where it is a question of infusing confidence in industrialists outside the House or assuring hon. Members of this House who might have doubts with regard to the *bona fides* of Government in this regard, I am happy to say that I have no intention of going farther beyond what has been stated in this magazine, which is not a supporter—and certainly not a consistent supporter—of Government in its policies in this sphere.

I shall now very briefly deal with certain of the provisions that are covered by this Bill, not because they need any underlining—because they are simple enough—but because it may perhaps be deemed to be a matter of discourtesy if I did not refer to these matters. Clause 2 of this measure defines "existing industrial undertaking". This phrase occurs in a number of places in the Act and a definition is therefore needed. Clause 2(ii) defines a "new article". It is a matter where a certain amount of misgiving might be caused, but it is not our intention to raise a scare unduly. Sub-clause (ii) of clause 2 seeks to define a "new article". I would suggest to hon. Members that they should read this provision with clause 6 of the Bill, because that is the operating clause. The provisions of the present section 11 of the Act do not make it clear whether the expression "establish a new industrial undertaking" will cover cases of undertakings manufacturing articles falling under a different scheduled industry or of articles bearing a new mark as defined in the Trade Marks Act or which are the subject of a new patent. It has therefore been provided that a licence or permission should be obtained, or the existing licence or permission should be suitably amended before any undertaking proposes to manufacture such an article, and these are termed as new articles for the purpose of this Act. I might amplify this provision by giving an illustration. There are a number of units in this country, both Indian and foreign, and there is nothing to prevent them from manufacturing a new article or a new branded article. It may be a tooth paste. It may have a new name. They might take a licence and the article may be from a foreign producer. If any foreign exchange is involved, they have to obtain the permission of Government. But oftentimes even this might not be brought to the notice of the Government, because they might say "we are not going to remit any money". A mere agreement as to payment of royalty does not come before Government; it is only when money has to be remitted that it comes before Government. We want even such cases to come before the Licensing Committee and we want them to tell us what is the type of royalty they would pay, what are the remittances that will have to be sent thereby, so that any expansion of industrial undertakings coming within the scope of the Schedule is not done without Government knowing about it and without Government specifically permitting it. That, to my mind, is a fairly important provision in view of the fact that we propose to keep a complete control over the type of development that we want in this country in the industrial field.

Clause 3 mentions the omission of section 4. I would like hon. Members not to be scared by this. It is not the intention that we want to rope in every industry, however small it might be, when we omit section 4 which limits the scope of the Licensing Committee's activities to industries which have a specified capital. Oftentimes the capital might be a small one, but then the working capital might be larger. The output of the industry might be quite large. Therefore, we felt that all these circumstances that occur should be suitably defined in rules, and we propose to do it by means of the section which deals with exemptions. In this connection I wish to apologize to the House for one printer's devil in the Statement of Objects and reasons where, instead of referring to the exemption section as section 29B, it says section 28. This proposed

section 29B is an amendment of section 28 which is the original exemption section; and it deals with the type of cases that we have in mind which will arise consequent on section 4 being omitted.

Clause 4(a) is really a matter of detail. It relates to the question of period of registration to be notified, and hon. Members would be able to understand it.

Similarly, clause 4(b) is, again, a question of detail.

Clause 5 gives powers for revocation of registration in certain cases, which would be necessary. There is no point in the licensing authority registering certain firms without having the power to revoke registration in circumstances that might arise from time to time.

Clause 8 is an amendment of the existing section 13. There is licensing of substantial expansions. As I said, in the case of a new article, the question of what is substantial expansion is a matter which is debated now and again. This particular clause deals with the licensing of substantial expansions and indicates what in the view of Government are substantial expansions—though we have another clause later on which says that in these matters the opinion of Government is final.

Clause 10 gives power to cause investigations to be made in scheduled industries. I think I have to deal with it at some length because, as I said, barring the changes in section 17, this is another clause which might cause some apprehension in the minds of the public. I would refer hon. Members to the present section 15 which says that where the Central Government is of the opinion that in respect of any scheduled industrial undertaking there has been a fall in the volume of production, there is likely to be a marked deterioration in the quality of an article, or there is likely to be a rise in price and so on, they can issue notice. Hon. Members of the House will understand that this is very largely based on the recommendations of the Fiscal Commission in regard to the control to be exercised over industries, partly by Government and partly by the Tariff Commission in the case of protected industries.

The other clause of section 15 is clause (b) which, as it exists today, reads:

"Where the Central Government is of the opinion that any industrial undertaking is being managed in a manner likely to cause serious injury or damage to the interests of the consumers or a substantial body thereof, for whom the articles or any class of articles manufactured or produced therein are or is intended".

This, no doubt, is very comprehensive in its own way, but the question of proof of injury to the consumers is rather a difficult thing. This is a matter in which Government must determine whether an interference is necessary or not. Therefore, we want that this particular sub-section has to be amended in the following manner, namely:

> "any industrial undertaking is being managed in a manner highly detrimental to the scheduled industry concerned or to public interest".

Well, it is very wide, I agree. But it must also be conceded that it is only investigation and nothing more. In fact, other similar Acts like the Companies Act, give powers to the shareholders in certain matters like this—though the operation takes a long time. Very possibly the Companies Act might be amended so as to enable the Government authority which controls to act in a manner similar to what we have indicated here. I know this is the one provision, barring the other one which I have mentioned, namely amendment of section 17, which gives a certain amount of misgivings. But there is no point in Government having powers which are categorised under the present sub-section (b); because it does not lead us anywhere, it is practically a dead letter. Therefore, we thought it needs to be amended.

Clause 11 is a deletion of section 17. I have dealt with this particular matter. I would like to mention that the new Chapter that comes in, that is Chapter IIIA is really a reproduction of section 17 in a different form. It is a copy, almost verbatim, of the analogous provisions in the Industrial Finance Corporation Act. It may be that imitation is the best form of flattery and I must pay a tribute to those people who have framed this. There the whole idea has been: how could the Industrial Finance Corporation work the industries which owe money to it? Just by taking over. Our position is very nearly the same. There they have to take them over because they are creditors. Here I have to do so because I am a trustee. The point I would like to emphasise is that the Government's position is

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

no more than that of a trustee. While I will not like to touch upon the forbidden ground and speak about nationalisation or something against it, I would like to state very categorically that this is not to be used as a method for nationalisation of industries. The vested interests, if they want an assurance, can have it. When we nationalise industries, we shall do it in a very straightforward manner. But these particular provisions are intended, as I have said times without number on the floor of the House, to keep the wheels of industry moving. And our intention is merely to act as a trustee. Normally we will go to the court and ask the court to appoint a receiver. But all those things we cannot do now, because we cannot afford the time lag, for one thing, and the adjudication of private interests which will arise therefrom and the risks and doubts in regard to decisions that are almost germane to such proceedings. Here Government must be the sole judge to decide whether a particular unit is necessary for the economy of the country and they must keep it going. Opportunities might arise of collision between labour and management. The management might say: we will close down the industry—merely because they want to spite labour. There are all kinds of conditions that arise from time to time. I would also like to mention that the very fact that this Chapter IIIA is in the statute book—if the House permits it to go into the statute book—is ultimately a guarantee against misbehaviour. We might have to use it in certain cases. I would largely rely on the fact that Government have the powers to see that the industrial units behave than by the exercise of those powers. I will not labour at length in regard to these provisions which, as I said, have been passed by this House in connection with the Industrial Finance Corporation Act.

I now come to Chapter IIIB. Here, I would like to assure hon. Members of this House that there is no intention to augment the powers of Government. At the present moment price control is exercised by Government under the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act which will lapse in 1954 and the Supply of Goods and Prices Act which is being renewed every year with the cooperation of the Council of States. We find that the responsibilities that Government have in regard to scheduled industries are so comprehensive that without some kind of power to control prices that responsibility could not be discharged. I know hon. Members of this House oftentimes ask us: "Why do you have price control? While you have relaxed it in one direction, why do you not relax it in the other as well." The question of relaxation of price control or the exercise of it is a matter which must be determined by the exigencies of a particular industry and also by the supply of its goods. My hon. friend, Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand the other day put a question: "Well, you have relaxed price control with regard to certain types of textiles: when will Government relax control on others?"

Shri Tulsidas (Mehsana West): I did not mean price control: it was production control.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He puts so many questions that sometimes between production and prices there is a little confusion. I know he is coming a little later with a number of questions dealing with price control and analogous subjects. I think I have got to answer them on the next question day. That is why the confusion in my mind arises.

It is a very legitimate question. Price control is not exercised merely for the pleasure of it, because I know the headache that it causes. Oftentimes the fixation of a price which is supposed to be the ceiling acts as the floor, so much so the consumer whom we want to benefit pays necessarily a higher price without the competitive elements in the markets operating to his advantage. That is what has happened in the textile industry today. We have to fix the price margin for the various units in the distributive trade and naturally Government have to be fairly liberal, or they are accused of being niggardly. It has happened today that in regard to various commodities over which price control has been removed, trade margins have shrunk: The benefit of this to a very large extent goes to the consumer. It is not a question of Government going and imposing control. There is another aspect also—in regard to future development of industry. As I said in this House while replying to Demands for Grants of Commerce and Industry Ministry, Government would have actively to enter into the field of expanding industries and promote the floatation of concerns. If it does so, then it will have to make it a

profitable one—or at any rate see that it does not lose, for which prices have to be controlled. If, on the other hand, it gives guarantees of return, as we might conceivably do in future in certain selected industries, then the only way in which I can see that the guarantee is not invoked is to see that the prices that are given are such that there is no possibility of the guarantee being invoked. So, price control has to be an integral part of the economic policy of this Government, as of any other Government that might come in future. It is merely by way of abundant caution that in amending legislation that I am bringing forward before the House, whether it be the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, or the Tea Control Act, or any other Act, we do take powers now to control prices, because I am visualising a period when I will not have to come and ask the other House to extend the life of the Supply of Goods and Prices Act and also a time when probably this hotch-potch of the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act with powers that have been conferred on Government during the exigencies of war-time—a Government which was not a popular Government—would no longer be in operation and we shall have a new set-up of price control properly steam-lined to see that abuses are avoided as much as possible. I do not think it worthwhile to labour this particular point at this moment.

As I said before in regard to the question of definition what is substantial expansion, what is a new article, etc., Government's position in this matter will have to be more or less final and clause 13 deals with this particular subject.

The others are more or less consequential. We have completely recast a number of sections, from section 23 onwards and clauses 16 and thereafter deal with it—delegation of powers, power to issue directions, cognizance of offences, burden of proof, jurisdiction of courts, etc. These are really reproduction of the powers that are now vested in Government under the Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, in so far as they are needed for the purpose of price control.

I have referred to the exemption clause, in regard to which a printer's devil has occurred in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. It should be 29B and not 28. The present clause is a little more comprehensive than the original section, as we are omitting, or at any rate seek to omit clause 4.

That sums up this amending measure. I would like once again to state that while the amendments are very important in themselves, they are neither revolutionary nor are they intended to arm Government with secret powers which can be used to the detriment of the industry. Nor is there any attempt to augment the powers of Government. These are amendments which we have found necessary by working the Act for one year, on the lines indicated by the House which passed the Act.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri N. V. Gadgil, Prof. Diwan Chand Sharma, Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta, Shri Govind Hari Deshpande, Shri Fulshinhji B. Dabhi, Shri Upendranath Barman, Dr. Jayantilal Narbheram Parekh, Shri Abdus Sattar, Shri S. C. Deb, Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra, Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad', Shri Radhelal Vyas, Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shri K. G. Deshmukh, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao Diwan, Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha, Shri G. R. Damodaran, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh, Shri Shri Chand Singhal, Shri Baij Nath Kureel, Shri Chaturbhuj V. Jasani, Shri Vishwambhar Dayal Tripathi, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri Durga Charan Banerjee, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri Kamal Kumar Basu, Shri G. D. Somani, Dr. Indubhai B. Amin, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri Choithram P. Gidwani, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri B. Rajagopala Rao, and the Mover, with instructions to report by the 29th April, 1953."

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta North-East): The Bill before the House goes to a Select Committee and so it is better to confine ourselves to certain more or less general observations. I must confess that when I read the Bill I was prepared to offer a few bouquets to the hon. Minister. But having heard the speech which he has just made, I am constrained somewhat to change my opinion.

I found him, quite unnecessarily to be very apologetic about character of the measure which

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

has placed before the House. He has said that Government would not interfere very much with the state of things as it is, that he does not like to disturb what he chose to call the 'equilibrium of our economy' in this country. I should think that in this State which professes—quite hypocritically—to be a welfare State, equilibrium is something which at any rate we do not find in existence at the present moment. Of course, the hon. Minister went out of his way, I feel, to placate those interests, vested interests—that was the expression which he used—which behaved in such a manner that two years ago the principal Act was absolutely necessary. I fear that the hon. Minister in expounding his proposition when he put forward his motion has made certain observations which strengthen the suspicion which, I shall say openly, we have about the intentions of Government in regard to this kind of legislation. We do not say that straightway in this country we can get large scale nationalisation but I do not see why the hon. Minister should assure vested interests. He said: "If vested interests want an assurance, they will have it now, that this is no step even in some future towards the nationalisation of the industry". This is a kind of thing which suggests which way the wind is blowing. This shows how we are even sheering away from the problems placed before the country in that by no means revolutionary document, the Industrial Policy Statement of 1948.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: On a point of explanation. All that I said was this is not the weapon that is to be used. I am not really going back on any policy of Government. What I said was that that is not the weapon I am going to use.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I accept what the hon. Minister says for what it is worth but I feel that ever since the promulgation of the Industrial Policy Statement of 1948, Governmental action has gone in such a fashion that suspicion has grown in the minds of people that there is no real intention to reshape our economy and it is only on the basis of Governmental determination to reshape our economy that we are prepared to welcome the Bill which is before the House.

We know that this Bill is very important because the Planning Commission has pointed out very clearly that one of the principal instruments which it shall use in order to ensure that the private sector of industry carries out the programme of development laid down before it is the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act and therefore it is very necessary that this Industries (Development and Regulation) Act is tightened. In so far as the tightening of the Act is done by means of this amending measure, in so far as it goes, we are prepared to welcome the measure but I fear, as I said before, that whatever Government does is vitiated by its general approach, its dependence on the private sector so that even when it does a good thing it becomes something like the proverbial curate's egg which is good only in parts and therefore not particularly palatable. We find again that while on the one hand this Bill is certainly a renewed recognition that *laissez faire* economics is really and truly played out, we do not find any intention on the part of the Government towards going a little faster, a little more effectively towards implementing the desire of our people for economic betterment. For example, I would say that we have not a limitation on the profits of industries which was in a way proposed by the Congress Government in the Industries Bill of 1948. If that Bill was properly worked—a big 'if' under the present dispensation—perhaps some Rs. 200 crores could be realised for our Plan every year but in any case we get in this measure some attempt to tighten the Bill of 1951 and to that extent, I am prepared to welcome it.

10 A.M.

I would like to point out to Government, however, that it is very necessary that efforts are made to expand the sector of State-trading, of direct participation of the States in industrial pursuits. In regard to this I would quote certain figures from China where all observers, hostile or friendly, point out that a sea change has happened and the condition of the people has been transformed beyond recognition in China. We find from their figures regarding the annual financial revenue and expenditure since 1950 that if we take 100 to be the basic figure for 1950 in regard to the revenue from State enterprises, it grew to 351·20 in 1951, to 535·71 in 1952 and to 804·92 in 1953. Now these figures are very eloquent. They show how the sector of State trading, State participation in industrial pursuits is a very important sector and that we should no longer go on depending upon the private sector.

The Plan, however, has made it very clear that we largely depend on the ability of the private sector to implement programmes scheduled, and throughout the Plan as well as in the general policy of Government, we find this softness for the private sector. I do not see why we should be so particularly favourably inclined towards the private sector when actually the behaviour of the private sector is by no means commendable. For example, take the story of the development of the iron and steel industry. It is a private sector. It has impinged on the position in such a way that the development of basic industries in our country has not progressed. In 1949, the Ministry of Industry had issued a statement which said:

> "Government intend to set up new works by increasing the indigenous steel production by one million tons. Two alternative schemes are under consideration, the establishment of a unit with a capacity of one million tons and the setting up of two plants with a capacity of half a million tons each. Three engineering firms of international reputation have been obtained to make a rapid survey and give a technical report to Government, with respect to the types of works to be installed and they are actually working. The consultants have completed the survey. Government expect to take a decision in three months."

This was said in 1949. The plan was completed for two factories in Madhya Pradesh and in Orissa. The sites were chosen but nothing was done for three years because the private sector came into the picture and from the private sector it was represented that Government should do nothing of this sort and the profits which were being reaped by the private sector should not be disturbed. This kind of thing shows that the private sector has behaved in such a fashion that we could not go on depending upon them in that hopeless manner which was confessed in the speech of the hon. Minister

Now, in regard to the Development Councils, we know they have a very big job. I hope the hon. Minister conducts them in such a fashion that they perform the job efficiently.

The two main purposes of the Development Councils would be to develop productivity. In this regard, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a report which his own Department issued last year regarding the production and installed capacity of Indian industries in 1951 and 1952. In this report we find that in as many as 27 of the industries listed, installed capacity had been augmented during 1952 while production had declined. This is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. We find again in this report that there were unsatisfactory conditions in the manufacture of agricultural implements indicated by the statistics and this deserves very serious attention. In view of the emphasis justly laid upon improvement and increasing the production of agricultural implements, that is a matter of very great moment to our country but this disparity between the production and installed capacity of Indian industries in 1951-52 gives us very serious food for thought and I hope the hon. Minister will take note of it and see that the Development Councils really try to develop productivity.

Another purpose of the Development Councils is to settle the location of sites as far as industries are concerned. Here again we depend on industrialists to such an extent that some very fantastic things happen from time to time. I think a case was referred to by an hon. Member of this House, Dr. Meghnad Saha, regarding the peculiar policy followed by our private sector industrialists in regard to the location of industries. The instance was given of there being two aluminium factories, one in Travancore and the other near Asansol. These two factories, the Travancore Aluminium Co. Ltd., and the Aluminium Corporation Ltd. were functioning in a very peculiar fashion, functioning under the direct control of the Canadian Aluminium Co. Ltd. They were functioning in a peculiar fashion which is shown particularly by the location. The chief item in the manufacture of aluminium is electric power which costs 1/8th of an anna per unit in the Travancore factory. The Asansol factory charge four times that of Travancore though the factory was located in a coal area and there were no distribution problems and its electricity cost should not be more than 0·2 annas per unit. Now, a loan of Rs. 50 lakhs was given by the Industrial Finance Corporation to this company. What was happening in connection with the work of this company was, that the Travancore factory was drawing raw materials from a place in Bihar and preliminary processing was done in Bihar. Then it was sent to Travancore where pig aluminium was produced. To convert that into utensils, the whole thing was again sent to a factory at Belur near Calcutta. From Bihar to

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

Travancore and from Travancore to Calcutta, railway freight alone costs more than Rs. 600 per ton. All the time Government was paying a subsidy of something like Rs. 400 per ton so far as the production of the so-called Indian aluminium was concerned, because it could not compete with aluminium coming from Canada. This shows how, if we leave it to the private sector, they behave in a fashion which is mainly intended to ensure maximisation of their profits. If we go on depending on the industrialists, if we do not function our Development Councils independently, with a view to the real economic development of our country, surely, the Development Councils would come to naught.

The industrialists are today very jubilant at our Plan. Our Government's policy, as it is also illustrated in the Bill before the House, is such that the people are more or less petering out of the picture. I was reading in the *Eastern Economist*, the other day, where it was said editorially that it is no use Government spokesmen beating the air with appeals to the people because it is the private sector which has taken charge of the Plan. It said that it was no good asking the people to feel enthusiastic about the Plan because it was really the private sector which was going to work it.

The same note is found in a speech which was recently made by the head of the house of Birla at the annual meeting of the United Commercial Bank. There, Mr. G. D. Birla made certain observations which make it clear that he envisaged that in the near future the entire control and direction of the country's economy would be determined by those who are leaders of the private sector. He said, the Plan is here, let us all work it; it is the private sector alone which could undertake such a task. I am quoting:

> "It is a challenge to the private sector.....to plan for themselves and show and prove by actual achievement their importance and usefulness."

He said that in the private sector, the work of studying, surveying and planning should be undertaken by the leaders of large-scale industry. He said again:

> "They should sit down, examine the import list and determine what categories of goods imported by India could be produced within the country. They should then estimate the quantities needed in the next five years and then prepare plans for producing them in the country."

Mr. Birla has taken over the Plan so to speak and it is not for the people to work it. You have yourselves said that it is not necessary to appeal to the people and that you are leaving it to the private sector. This is a question which has to be taken into consideration very seriously. The record of the private sector being what it is, we cannot leave the right of determining the economic policy of the country and the methods of working that economy to the private sector. If, therefore, we have to make our Development Councils real, we must have a wide association of the people and the representatives of the people in the different industries in the working of these Development Councils. There is, of course, some provision in the Bill for representatives of the employees and also of the consumers. But, knowing the working of the Government as we do, we feel that this is by no means enough. I hope the Select Committee will try to find out ways and means of associating larger chunks of people with every layer of the work of the Development Councils. I wish that some mechanism is devised by means of which these Development Councils could be very many in number and distributed all over the place.

There is, of course, the objection of the powers that be, the objection of the vested interests that the Development Councils require a high standard of efficiency and therefore, Government perhaps would not be able to run these Development Councils and therefore, ultimately everything would be left to the private sector. I do not believe in that sort of objection at all. I feel there is enough talent in our country, if we tap our resources properly. If we send out a call to our people that we wish to see these Development Councils working on a large scale everywhere, if we ask for their participation, we shall find a very substantial contribution towards a constructive re-fashioning of our economy.

In regard to this, I am quoting what Sidney and Beatrice Webb, who, as long as they were alive, were perhaps the greatest sociological investigators in the English-speaking world, wrote about the conditions that they found in the Soviet Union in 1935. They wrote in their book *Soviet Communism* that:

> "Apart from salaried staff as exists, as many as 50,000 citizens

. are at any moment participating in the administration of Moscow and nearly as many in that of Leningrad:

That 70,000 village councils are enjoying 'an unprecedented freedom without such safeguards as prior enquiry and sanction, a statutory maximum for local expenditure and limit to local taxation'.

That besides the salaried staff, 3 million trade union members are at any time engaged in the 186,640 factory committees and shop committees and their sub-committees, so that, apart from the officers paid and unpaid, at least 15 per cent. of the trade union members are actively engaged in committee work."

I know that this cannot be duplicated here because the conditions are very different. But at any rate, we can mobilies the resources of our people for a large number of these Development Councils, at different layers and then co-ordinate them at the Central level. Then and then alone, can we enthuse the people and also get that kind of suggestion for industrial development as would redound to the basic interests of our country.

I have certain charges regarding the very soft attitude which the Government have shown, particularly towards the managing agencies. Even in the Plan, while note is taken of the very cogent criticisms made in regard to the work of these managing agencies in our country, there is at the same time a confession that the managing agencies have to be entrusted with the real job. These managing agencies have generally behaved in a fashion which does not entitle them to this kind of very special consideration. I shall refer in particular to the British managing agencies who rule the roost in Calcutta, who have lately, as the hon. Minister may be well aware, entered into so many amalgamation enterprises that their power today is a colossus: the amalgamation of Bird with Heilgers, Jardine Skinner with George Henderson, McLeod with Begg Dunlop, McNeil and Barry and Kilburn Begg Sutherland and B.I. Corporation -- these show how giants have become super giants. I will give one example of how it functions. There is Andrew Yule Co. in Calcutta with a paid up capital of Rs. 18 lakhs. It manages 57 companies, jute, coal, tea, engineering, sugar, paper, transport, rubber etc. which have more than Rs. 11 crores as paid up capital. One of . Andrew Yule's Coal companies, the Bengal Coal Co. has a paid up capital of Rs. 110 lakhs and it has permanent rights over 90,000 acres of the very best coal land in West Bengal. In the period 1945-49, they made a net profit of Rs. 310 lakhs. We find again Burmah Shell and Standard Vacuum coming together in order to set up refineries near Bombay and Calcutta. We find such organisations as the B.I. Corporation whose profits as managing agents went up from Rs. 39,28,193 in 1945 to Rs. 105,76,358 in 1950. We have again Bird and Heilgers. They are managing agents for 57 companies. They have got the largest lime manufacturing factory in India and they are the biggest suppliers of coking coal to steel industries. The Indian Steel industry has really to wait upon the good pleasure of Bird and Heilgers. This is the sort of thing that is going on all the time. If we are really interested in the development of our country, surely, we must take very good care about these managing agencies, specially these foreign managing agencies who have for so long ruled the roost in our country.

In this connection, I also want to say that a few days ago, a question was answered in this House, the exact details of which I cannot recollect; but it left the impression in my mind which, if it is wrong, I would like to have corrected, which I am trying to indicate. It referred to Caltex and its setting up of a refinery at Visakhapatnam. We understood from the tenor of the answers given in this House that Caltex was assured by Government against nationalization for a period of 25 years or so, that there was an agreement entered into with that company—which, of course was not laid on the Table of the House *in extenso;* only a summary was given—and the idea that we got was that this company was exempted, practically speaking, from the operation of sections 15 to 18 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act of 1951 which is now going to be amended. I do not want to say anything positively about it, but if there is any such concession in the mind of Government, then Government should come out and make its position clear. There should be no loophole left so that this kind of foreign concessionaires can come into this country and exercise powers which are by no means warranted.

I should, therefore, say that this is a measure which we are prepared to welcome from our side because it tries to tighten up somewhat the Act of 1951, but we would say at the same time that this is a measure which

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

leaves most things to the private sector of industry, and that is a policy which will be disastrous as far as the interests of the country are concerned.

I would also refer to one other matter, and that is the absence from the Schedule of any mention of such industries as tea, for example.' I hope that when the Tea Bill.....

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Tea is covered by another legislation.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I know that the Tea Bill has been reported upon by the Select Committee, but actually there was a feeling—I do not think I am revealing any confidences—that in regard to the misbehaviour of those who are in charge of the management of the tea gardens, Government has not got ample provision which is comparable to the provisions which are now incorporated in this amending Bill. In order to make things clear, I should think that tea might perhaps be included in the Schedule. If it is not proposed to do that, I would like to have from Government some kind of explanation regarding how such industries as tea are going to come within the purview of the kind of legislation which we have before us.

I would say in conclusion that we wish Government to go ahead with courage, we wish Government to shed its pusillanimity, we wish Government really to try to transform the economy of our country for the welfare of our people. We are prepared to help Government, in so far as it is possible for us, in so far as the achievement of these objectives is concerned. But we want to be sure that Government is really on the right track. We feel that Government with its record, and Government with its present formulations of policy are sort of accentuating the mistrust which we have in regard to the real intentions of the administration. If our mistrust can be removed, we surely would come forward and we shall try to help Government as much as is possible for us to do.

Shri K. K. Desai (Halar): The Bill before this House requires to be considered from the background of our own environments and our own country. The industrial policy of the Government has been declared in 1948, and on the basis of that industrial policy and the democratic set-up of this country under our Constitution, the Planning Commission has made certain recommendations and placed before the country the picture of the development of our economy in a realistic fashion. While we consider any measure of industrial development or agricultural development, we have not got to consider exactly what is happening either in America or in the United Kingdom or in Soviet Russia or in China, because in all those four countries their economies have developed in peculiar ways, and unless those environments and those circumstances are sought to be repeated in this decade, obviously we cannot imitate them. Of course, we may take some lessons, something that will suit us, from any of those four countries which are being named in season and out of season on the floor of this House by interests actuated or by persons actuated in order to serve or subserve their own interest. We have got to develop our economy, raise up our standard of living according to our Indian technique, our own method and our own mind. These are some of the preliminary observations which I would like to place before this House. With regard to the Bill before this House, at the outset I would say that the hon. Minister has been unnecessarily defensive in what he is doing. He has amended the 1951 Act as he should have done because the Planning Commission has said that the type of Plan which they have placed before the country depends mainly on how the private sector behaves in the planning period, and any *laissez-faire* in contrast to that planning is inconsistent. The private sector has got to behave with a view to subserve the interests of the country and the consumers, and their habits have to be changed. If they do not change, more and more we would have to bring them under control and discipline by legislation. This Bill has become necessary in view of the situation that had developed after the 1951 Act was enacted. The hon. Minister has stated that the private sector need not feel worried about it.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Unduly worried.

Shri K. K. Desai: They need not be unduly worried about it. Why should this sort of general assurance be given to them? That section of the private sector which is behaving properly need not fear this legislation it is obvious, but there is a section in the private sector which would like to continue as usual, and this Bill is designed to bring it under discipline and control when it is found necessary. But, at the same time, I would like to say that the Government do intend, I believe, to take

action under section 15 and amended section 18A. Now, as far as section 18A is concerned, that section only operates when the Government is satisfied that a particular industry or unit of an industry is either badly managed or is working against the public interest. After they come to that conclusion, section 18A will come into operation. Under that section, the Government can take over the industry. This House is aware that sometime in June 1950, this House had to pass a special law, called the Sholapur Spinning and Weaving Mills Bill. But once the Government assume those powers under this Bill, such special legislation need not be enacted. If any unit of industry is not working properly or entails, by its mismanagement, unnecessary unemployment to thousands of workers, then it will be served with a notice that the way in which it is conducting the affairs of the concern will be investigated, and if it is found after investigation that in the interests of the country as well as the employees and production that the industry would have to be taken over, or any particular unit of it would have to be taken over, then the Government will take it over. Under this Bill, the powers that the Government are assuming will make it easy for them to take them over and keep them going.

During the last one and a half years, it has been found that even though certain powers had been taken under sections 15 and 17, they could not be exercised, because certain matters had to be approved. Under the amended section 15, if the Government feel that the unit is not being managed properly in the public interest, then they can issue directions for investigation. I know of quite a number of textile mills in Ahmedabad, Bombay, and Rajasthan, which are being mismanaged, whereas in the same centres, 95 per cent. of the mills are working better with profits. But half a dozen mills are not working properly, and they close down, thereby rendering thousands of people unemployed, and at the same time there is curtailment of production also. In a planned economy, when a particular target has been set for production, any attempt on the part of the employer either by mismanagement or by any concerted action to curtail production is, in my opinion, detrimental to the interests of the people. Under such circumstances, the powers that the Government are assuming are necessary. Just at present, there is one case of a mill in Ajmer State, which is a Part C State. Part C State, as such, according to me, is a useless appendage, and the sooner it will be merged with the neighbouring areas, the better. But this particular incident has come to our notice. A case has come to our notice where a particular mill at Vizianagaram was paying only one third of the wages paid either in Bombay or in Ahmedabad, Sholapur or Kanpur, but still it is not able to make the unit work properly. The Minimum Wages Act has laid down a sort of minimum wage for that mill, which is about half of that in Ahmedabad or Bombay, but the moment the Act came to be enforced, the mill closed down. Obviously, it is very clear that the management of that particular mill must be of a very bad kind. Otherwise, why should this particular mill close down, when mills paying nearly double the wages are working properly in other centres? This section as amended will now enable the Government to take over such a concern.

I have confined my remarks only to sections 15 and 17, as they are in my opinion, the most important sections in this legislation. I know that the vested interests or those people who are accustomed to run their concerns in their individual or private interests, will say that the Government are going too far. But they have got to realise that the times have changed, and that this democratic Government would not permit them to run their undertakings in their own way. As Mr. H. N. Mukerjee has stated, we ought to take note of what they say. I do not think there is anything wrong in what Mr. Birla has said to his friends, *viz.*, "You are now on trial, you will now have to change your old habits, the habit of looking at things in the way you have been accustomed to look at. You are on trial, and if you do not subserve the interests of the people and the consumer, you will be wiped out." I think it is a very healthy advice that Shri Birla has given. It is really true that they are on a trial. I hope that the powers that the Government are taking under sections 15 and 17 are not meant merely to be on the statute book, but that they are meant to be exercised. When such cases come to the notice of Government, and they take action promptly, that will create a healthy fear in the minds of those who intend to misbehave. So, as Mr. Birla has said the employers or the vested interests are on trial. The Government also are on their trial, as to whether they are prepared to take action against the recalcitrant employers or vested interests so as to bring them round to the policy which the Government have in view, or whether

[Shri K. K. Desai]

they will go on finding excuses one way or the other not to utilise the powers which they are taking under this Bill. We are prepared to give these powers to the Government, not for putting them merely on the statute book, but with a view to getting them exercised.

With these few words, I support the Bill.

Shri Tulsidas: I rise to make a few observations on this Bill. In the speech of the hon. Minister that I heard just a little while ago, I was expecting that he would make out a case for the comprehensive amendments contemplated in the Bill, but I was rather disappointed. I do not think that a proper case has been made out for tightening the measure, as is envisaged in the Bill. I wondered how even our practical-minded Minister could allow his feelings to rule his head. As one of the poets had said:

"Oh! what a tangled web..."

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee (Calcutta South-East): Oh! what a mischief the Finance Minister has done; every one is a poet now.

Shri Tulsidas: As one of the poets had said:

"Oh! what a tangled web we weave,

Once we begin to deceive".

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Let me have some poetry in my little prosaic life.

Shri Tulsidas: If he were in touch with modern legislation, particularly control legislations, he might have said:

"Oh! what a tangled web we weave,

Once we begin to legislate."

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): Who is the poet?

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Shri Tulsidas.

Shri Tulsidas: That does not matter.

I do not wish to give the impression that I am opposed to all the clauses of this Bill. There may be necessity for having certain clauses, but, as I said, I do not find that a proper case has been made out by the hon. Minister for these measures which are, in my opinion, very stringent and very arbitrary for a Bill which is in the nature of a permanent statute. Therefore, we have to view these measures not merely from the point of view of an emergency measure of a temporary character but from the point of view that it is of a permanent nature.

The House knows that this Bill was first introduced in the year 1949 and there was a lot of controversy and it had to be postponed for a year or so. There were two Select Committees appointed, and ultimately it was passed in 1951. In the reports of the Select Committees the view expressed was that arbitrary powers of such a nature, as was introduced at that time, should not be given to the Government. But I find that within two years these very powers are now sought by having this amendment of the Act. This Act has not even operated in its full sense; it has only had a life of a year and a half or two.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: One year only.

Shri Tulsidas: Only one year. I do not find the reason why this amending Bill has been brought forward in such a short time.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Birth day is over.

Shri Tulsidas: This Bill amends practically 15 sections out of the 32 sections of the Act. Then there are two new chapters. Therefore, practically the whole Act is revised.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri (Azamgarh Distt.—East *cum* Ballia Distt.—West): Complete overhaul.

Shri Tulsidas: Within one year and a half of the life of this Act, I do not see really any cause for amending it, because, as the hon. Minister just pointed out, production is rising and hence there is no reason for it. But he only wants a cover so that in future whatever schemes he may have with regard to substantial expansion or putting up new industries, he can go forward without the least hesitation.

Then I heard on this side the hon. Member, Shri Hiren Mukerjee's speech. Of course, I do not want to refer to the points which he made out which, in my opinion, are more relevant for a Bill like amendment of the Indian Companies Act or something of that nature. They have nothing to do with this Bill. However, I do not know, when in the country a certain congenial atmosphere is created and when Government has found that with this atmosphere things are improving, why such a legislation is brought forward to amend the Act completely which is bound to create misgivings in the minds of people interested in this sector, particularly in the industrial sector.

I have been listening to what is said about this private sector. There have been misgivings on the part of both sides, including Mr. Khandubhai Desai and other people. Do I understand that in the private sector labour has no part to play and that it is only the industries or the business people who have a part to play? Is labour not included in the private sector? When labour refuses to do a little extra work and when production goes down, then no question is raised that there has been misbehaviour on the part of labour. But if a particular industry is not working because it is not economical for that industry to work, then it is considered a misbehaviour on the part of the industry. What are the reasons why people do not go into the thing and see whether labour has misbehaved or not—whether it is entirely because of labour or for some other reasons?

The hon. Member, Shri Khandubhai Desai has pointed out that in the year 1948 there was necessity of having a new Act which was for taking over the Sholapur Mills. I may inform the House that I am a director at present on that Board on behalf of the Government.

Shri Jaipal Singh (Ranchi West—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Why are you sitting this side then?

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Circumstances change.

Shri Tulsidas: I have pointed out the difficulties that we have had in managing this concern. An amount of finance is required for working this concern. It has already borrowed with the guarantee of the Government to the extent of Rs. one crore and 25 lakhs. It is not possible to run this industry as efficiently as any other textile mill could be run, because the mill is a very old one and requires complete rehabilitation. It will require, therefore, a further amount of a crore of rupees before the mill can be made efficient or economical. Now, how is it possible, even if we assume these powers to take over an industry or a factory and run it by Government and make it efficient and economical unless and until the Government is prepared to put in the money? If the Government is not prepared to put in the money, well, why allow it to be run by the Government?

There were cases in the past when Government was unable to run these factories. I am sure my hon. friend, Mr. Shastri will know that in U.P. the Government was very keen to run two or three factories. They actually took over the management of one of the factories, but they found it impossible to run it. And so they gave it back.

It is not merely because there is a complete misbehaviour on the part of industry that the mills or factories are not able to run. I thereby do not say that the entire industry is to be completely absolved of all the blame. There may be some cases—one or two —but generally whenever an industry or a factory is not able to run, it is, I can assure you, not because there is complete misbehaviour on the part of the management, but there is also a certain amount of misbehaviour on the part of labour.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Shri Tulsidas: Some labour leaders will say: "Labour must not be affected in any way. They must be paid a certain amount and they must not be retrenched. Even though retrenchment is required, you cannot retrench even one person and even if there is surplus labour, you must carry on."

Shri Nambiar (Mayuram): It is time for expansion, not retrenchment.

Shri Tulsidas: I have pointed out all these difficulties.

I would now like to refer to some clauses of this Bill. Up till now, in several cases, the industries were required to approach the Government before they could expand by putting up new machinery or taking a licence etc. Now, at every stage, the industry will have to go to the Government; whether it is a question of expansion by putting up extra machinery, or by putting up something which may be considered as a by-product. This is new. Till now the industry which had a capital of more than one lakh was required to go to the Ministry. But, now that provision is deleted. Therefore, even a smaller unit of Rs. 50,000 or even Rs. 25,000 will have to go to the Government at every stage. I do not know how the smaller units are going to understand the implications of this complex legislation. This law imposes penalties. How will this Act operate? It seems to me that it will create much more confusion than real development as the Bill contemplates.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Then why not move an amendment that this should be called "The Industries Confusion Bill"?

Shri Tulsidas: I quite understand that people who like to have powers are eager to have more powers. The hon. Minister says that production is

[Shri Tulsidas]

going up. Therefore, there is really no abuse at present. He wants to do something in the future when the necessity arises. We do not know for what purpose do Government want to have these powers as a permanent feature.

Then, I want to know from the hon. Commerce Minister whether the Central Advisory Council was consulted and whether it agreed to the amendments which have now been brought forward. I do not know what their views were.

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : बिना उन से पूछे यह बिल कैसे आया ?

Shri Tulsidas: I do not know and I would like to hear in this connection from the hon. Commerce Minister.

Now, take the new chapter, Chapter IIIA. It is with regard to taking over the different concerns after investigation. The Government has taken powers to do away with the process of issuing directions in some cases, which, in my opinion, goes counter. Because, when a certain investigation has been made and a direction is issued to a particular factory, and if it is not obeyed, then I can understand the Government taking over, and everything else. But, here, without giving any directions, the Government will automatically step in.

Then, I would like to show that in view of this new chapter, sub-section (4) (b) of section 5 of the Act requires to be amended. Section 5 of the Act requires the Central Government to consult the Central Advisory Council in regard to its exercising any of the powers conferred upon the Government under section 16 or sub-section (1) of section 17. This sub-section relates to the special provisions of direct control by Central Government, and this matter is now covered by sub-section (1) of section 18. A relevant amendment of section 5 must, therefore, be made, because there seems to be an over-sight on the part of the Government.

As I have pointed out, more and more powers are taken by the Government. Under the Act the Government was required to decide these questions of licences within six months, whether they are to be issued or not. Now, an amendment has been brought in and the period of limitation has been removed. That shows how people will find it difficult, as even this period of six months for coming to a decision on the question of issuing a licence is being removed.

Then, there is another new chapter, Chapter IIIB. It is for the control of supply, distribution, price etc. of certain articles. The Commerce Minister has explained the reason why this chapter has been introduced. The Essential Supplies (Temporary Powers) Act, will have life only up to 1955. Most of these wide powers were taken under that Act. But here, again, I would like to point out to the hon. Commerce Minister that when this Essential Supplies Act was discussed in this House last session or last year, I made a suggestion about having a Committee appointed on commodity controls. I am glad to see that the hon. Commerce Minister has appointed that Committee to go into the different commodity controls, and to find out how the different laws controlling and regulating them should be used. We do not know exactly what the recommendations of that Committee are. I do not know why these extraordinary powers are now sought for. Though these powers are very extraordinary, there is one reason for which I could really support the Central Government to take these powers, because thereby at least each different State cannot interfere with an industry or the articles which the industry produces. There would be a co-ordinating body which would direct or control the manufacture and the raw materials required for any industry, whether it is in one State or another. Therefore, to that extent, even though the powers are extraordinary, I have no objection to Government having these powers.

Then there is the question of new section 23. The decision of the Central Government in respect of certain matters such as substantial expansion etc. is final under the new section. Here again, I would suggest that the decision of the Government under section 23 should be placed before the sub-Committee of the Central Advisory Council, which is empowered to renew the licences issued, or amended by Government. There should be some sort of court to which there may be an appeal. The Government's decision may be final, but, I think, there should be an appeal.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The hon. Member apparently does not know that all these Committees are advisory.

Shri Tulsidas: But, I think, we should refer the matter to the sub-committee before Government makes

a decision. The Council will be able to know whether the Government's decision would be based on certain facts.

Then, I come to amendment of section 24, insertion of new section 24A and substitution of sections 25 to 29. These sections relate mostly to penalties and jurisdiction of courts etc. Here, under section 18G, the Government has power to control the supply, distribution etc. of certain articles. I would suggest that when the penalties are inflicted at least for technical matters, the people who are in charge of the technical matters should be made responsible for the penalty. When the question of policy matters is concerned, those on the higher level, the board of directors or the managing agents or anybody else may be held responsible; but, where it is a technical offence, where the penalties are for the infringement of technical matters, there, I think, the penalty should be confined to the technical personnel. There are different types of companies where the boards of directors are in an advisory capacity. It is difficult for them to continue if they are to be penalised for any technical offences, which is no fault of theirs. Therefore, I feel that in this particular matter, certain differences should be made so that people who are really responsible would be able to bear their responsibilities.

I hope that the Select Committee will go into my suggestions and take steps to see that many of these arbitrary powers that are sought to be taken are omitted altogether, or if they must be retained, then provisions are made for appeal, so that people will not feel that these powers may be used by Government to force people to do certain things. The provisions are very rigid, and I think a certain amount of flexibility needs to be introduced in these powers.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It is with some hesitation that I rise to speak on this Bill, because of the association which I had with this measure when this matter was first considered by Government and I was in charge of the Bill which was brought before the last Parliament. I sympathise with the last speaker, Shri Tulsidas Kilachand. My memory is not very short. It just went back to those days when we were holding the meetings of the Select Committee—and you, Sir, were also a member of that body—and the most vociferous spokesman against the Bill was none other than my hon. friend Shri Tulsidas Kilachand himself. But today I found that he was very mild. He had almost made up his mind to accept the Bill, subject to certain changes.

There is no doubt that this Bill is a logical corollary to the 1951 Act. In fact, as the hon. Minister himself stated in his opening remarks, perhaps these changes might have been incorporated in the original Bill itself, but let us look at this matter from a practical standpoint. My hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee attacked and criticised the Minister and said that he was apologetic and he should not have given any assurance that this Bill was not intended for nationalisation. I do not think the Minister was apologetic. He said something which was quite true. Let us face the facts squarely. This is not a Bill intended for nationalisation of Indian industries, whether such nationalisation should come; when it should come; how it should come: these are certainly matters which can be discussed, and these are matters which may form part of a separate pieces of legislation.

[SHRIMATI AMMU SWAMINADHAN *in the Chair*]

But this Act has a definite objective It recognises that the private sector in the field of industry *will* operate in this country. It recognises that necessary facilities will be made available to private enterprise, so that it can fulfil its great task for the economic development of the country. If it is held that there should be no private sector at all, then of course the approach must be entirely different and we have to look at the matter from a completely different angle of vision. That may be a right approach —I am not saying anything on its merit—but it has to be discussed from a different perspective. Here, we proceed on the assumption that in certain defined spheres, private industrialists in this country will be given full scope, provided they play their part well and faithfully and they accept the general economic programme of the country and discharge their obligations in a manner which will be consistent with national welfare.

11 A.M.

What is the main objective of this amending Bill? It is only in case there is an occasion for Government to take over an industrial undertaking that there will be the use of this Act, and the circumstances under which Government can move are also very clearly defined in the body of the Act and the amending sub-clause which has been proposed. The powers which Government should have also are mentioned. There were some

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

lacunae. Although Government might appoint somebody to take over an undertaking for the time being, there would be legal difficulties in such an authority functioning in an effective manner. An attempt has been made in this amending Bill to clothe the Government with legal authority, so that whatever may be the authority, whether it be an individual or a collection of individuals, that is created may function in a satisfactory manner without creating any legal or administrative difficulties. That is the main objective of the Bill, apart from some other matters which the Minister has already discussed.

Here, I would like to look at the matter from two points of view. First of all, it is only in the case of an industrial undertaking which is capable of being worked efficiently, whose finances are good, but which has been mismanaged, or which comes under one or the other of the sub-clauses mentioned—it is only in such a case that Government is entitled to intervene. Mind you, Government does not intervene immediately. There is an enquiry. A chance is given to the undertaking to explain its viewpoint and to meet the demands which are made by Government. Only after that chance has been given and Government is satisfied that it should intervene, there is the possibility of intervention by Government. Supposing the finances of the concern are good and its administrative mismanagement is remediable, then Government steps in. The Minister said in his speech that difficulty would arise in cases where an industrial undertaking cannot be run economically. The first class of cases to which I just now referred will not present much difficulty. If there has been mismanagement or failure or if the defect is in fact remediable, then this new authority which will come into being on behalf of the Government should be able to set right things, but supposing you find that a concern cannot be run economically, that it has no finances, and that it has not been guilty of any deliberate negligence, then what happens? The Bill does not provide for meeting such a contingency. In fact, I would like Government to go much farther.

Today, we see many industrial undertakings in the country which, for some reason or another, are closing down. It may be the fault of the employer. It may the fault of the labour. It may not be the fault of either. It may be that the plant and machinery are so out-dated that the concern is not capable of being run as an economic concern. It may be that there is lack of funds. Has Government any responsibility with regard to the continuance of such industrial undertakings? We are anxious today that the country should produce to the maximum possible extent of its industrial capacity. That is common ground among all parties in the country. We want further advance in at least those industrial undertakings which can produce and we are anxious that they should be helped to produce to the maximum extent possible. Here, I have not been able to understand quite clearly —in fact, this was my difficulty when I first mooted this question about four years ago as the Minister-in-charge—as to how exactly Government can intervene effectively unless it is prepared to shoulder financial responsibility for running such institutions. There is no half-way house. It is not a question of your taking charge of it for the time being and then running away from it. That is a matter to which the Minister himself made reference in his speech. I can appreciate the difficulty. It is a big and major problem for the country. I would certainly like to see established under the aegis of the Government some sort of Industrial Management Corporation which should have adequate funds and complete personnel at its disposal and which should be able to take over any industrial undertaking which is being compelled to close its doors either on account of inefficient management or otherwise. We must look at it from a much broader point of view than has been attempted in this Bill. This is all right. I am not opposing it. I am supporting, because this is a necessary amendment which must be made. Without these powers Government cannot function. My friend Shri Tulsidas Kilachand is unduly nervous. The Minister gave an assurance, and I think it was correctly given, that it was not intended by Government to interfere with any industry or industrial undertaking in the private sector provided they play their part faithfully and well. Because, after all, this is not something which any Government would like to shoulder just for the fun of it. It is a tremendous responsibility. Where a certain private management has failed and Government steps into its shoes the whole country will look at the Government. Government will be on its trial. Government cannot say it has failed because it had no money or due to lack of managerial experience or for the other reason. In fact private industrialists should be happy that Government is coming

forward today to face a responsibility which any national government, which wants to see that the industrial production in the country does not go down, must be able to face.

Of course the whole basis of this Act is co-operation. There is no other basis. Government cannot dictate; the employers or labour cannot dictate their terms. Such a measure can succeed only amidst circumstances where all the elements group together and are determined to make the functioning of an industrial undertaking a success.

One question arises with regard to this, namely managing agents. I find the possibility of handing over an undertaking to a managing agency has also been visualized. I personally agree with it. Because, when we had to deal with the Sholapur Mills case the difficulty at that time was that we had no power under the law to proceed, and I had to bring a measure before this House, only dealing with that particular industrial undertaking. And I did not hesitate to hand over the management to one of the foremost industrialists in the country, Shri V. N. Chandavarkar; and he also, along with other industrialists, was prepared to undertake the responsibility. But they had to face certain difficulties. Now, here, Government has to be extremely careful in selecting the agency to whom such control will be handed over; because if you make a mistake there, then the scheme will not succeed.

I would ask the Minister to consider another aspect of the matter. Very often the managing agency fails. Very often the managers fail. The shareholders of a company who do not represent any vested interests—they represent the ordinary, poor, middle-class people—sometimes in spite of their best will, they are completely overshadowed by some managing agents or others who just play with a particular industrial undertaking and bring it to a state of ruin. Is a *via media* possible? I know it means an amendment of the Indian Companies Act. It cannot be done through the back-door by an amendment of this Act. But still, personally speaking, before the Government steps into the shoes of the previous management, I would be prepared to give a chance to the shareholders to select another agency which will be able to run that institution in the best interests of the consumers and also of the public. I know this bristles with difficulties. I had explored this matter in consultation with legal experts and it was very difficult to find an acceptable solution, because there again the question of finance comes in. Who will care to carry somebody's baby where no funds are being placed at the disposal of such individual? So here, while giving my support to the general principles underlying this measure, I would request Government to consider this question a little more deeply. As the Minister said, he had during the last one year no occasion to apply the provisions of this Act; he tried in the case of Indore, but there also he could not succeed.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It was not necessary.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: It was not necessary. Perhaps the very threat was sufficient. That also will sometimes work. You may call it a sword of Damocles; but whatever you may call it, this Bill is a complete guarantee to all industrialists who want to play the game that the Government has no desire to interfere. But in case they do not play the game or in case there are difficulties, Government can step in.

But I would like these two points to be considered. Government should not merely confine itself to the categories it has mentioned. Of course public interest is mentioned. Public interest can include anything. In case you find that labour is not being properly looked after and a situation is being created which is preventing the particular undertaking from putting its best efforts into the bargain, there also Government should be able to give notice to that undertaking that unless it behaves properly Government would step in and take it over. But then there is that question of finance. And I would like to know something from the Minister as to how he is thinking over this matter and what plan he has in view. I would like this assurance to be given by Government now that no industrial undertaking will be allowed to shut its doors, and if it does, then Government steps in and takes it over and runs it in accordance with the overall policy of economic development that Government has before it.

With regard to the scheme for fixation of price and control of distribution, well, they are absolutely essential. And it is nothing new which is being done. It is virtually transferring the provisions of the Essential Supplies Act to the body of this measure.

I would also request the Minister to continue the provision for previous consultation with the Advisory Council before he takes such a drastic step. Then he would be able to put the

[Dr. S. P. Mookerjee]

onus on the industrialists themselves. and he would be able to place his cards on the table and justify the circumstances under which he is being compelled to take action against a particular undertaking. That previous consultation should be a normal feature of the administration of this Act.

I am also a bit perturbed by the proposal in the Bill that the limit of Rs. one lakh should be withdrawn, because I feel it will create administrative difficulties. It is like the Finance Minister increasing the minimum limit for imposition of income-tax. Very frankly he said, it will reduce the work of his Department and simultaneously give relief to about 70,000 persons in the whole country. If you do not have any limit at all, it will become an extremely difficult process either for these small undertakings throughout the country approaching Government or for Government acting effectively in respect of such a large number of undertakings. Of course the exemption clause is there where Government has power to exempt any particular undertaking or class of undertakings on the ground that it has a small number of workers. I do not know whether the Minister intends to proceed under that clause. But at any rate this is a matter which should be considered.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: In regard to capital employed and workers.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: So he might take advantage of that clause and have some sort of general application so as not to deal with this large number of small undertakings.

I would urge upon the Minister, with the experience that I had of matters such as this, that much would depend on the efficiency, integrity and quickness of despatch of business of the Government machinery. Government here is having a tremendous responsibility. I can understand a straightforward scheme of nationalisation. Well, there it is. The whole thing belongs to Government or to an organisation which is under the control of Government and Government does the whole thing without sharing responsibility with anybody-else, but here is a sphere which we are trying to encourage which will permit the private sector to function in this country. At the same time, there are so many clogs in the wheel right from the commencement of the licensing, altering the programme of production, functioning of the unit itself, prices, distribution, at every stage there is a clear possibility of Government coming into the field and ordering something to be done or not to be done. Now, the Government agencies should work quickly, efficiently, honestly without discrimination and really for the purpose of helping those who should be helped and not protecting those who should not be helped. These are very important considerations which go into the picture. If they fail, then the Bill will fail and then the private industrialists also will be able to throw the blame on the Government and say: "You created all these complications, you did not give this help and for that reason we have not been able to do what we wanted to do".

We are passing through a very critical phase in the history of our economic life. We have the report of the Planning Commission on the one hand. On the other, we have increasing unemployment in the country. We have the picture of a large number of undertakings closing down, big and small, throughout the length and breadth of the country. Now, in such circumstances, if the Government proceeds vigorously, efficiently and with a determined will to help the continuance of the total industrial output, only then we will be able to save the country from falling across the brink of disaster. Much will depend therefore on the mutual co-operation which we are able to enthuse amongst all sections concerned. I hope some of the suggestions which I have made will be considered by the Minister when the Bill will be discussed by the Select Committee and meanwhile, I extend to it my general support with regard to the main objectives of this measure.

श्री अलगूराय शास्त्री : मैं इस बिल पर कुछ बोलना आवश्यक नहीं समझता था । लेकिन एक बात यह खटकी कि सरकार यह जो हमारे उद्योग धन्धे हैं उनके बढ़ाने के लिए और उनकी उन्नति के लिए सरकार क्या करना चाहती है इस बात का इस बिल में कोई बहुत स्पष्ट उत्तर नहीं मिलता । ऐसा तो दिखायी पड़ता है कि जैसे म्युनिसिपैलिटीज इक्के और तांगों को लाइसेंस देती है और अगर कोई शिकायत हो तो वह लाइसेंस रद्द कर देती है । यह चीज तो दिखायी देती है । लेकिन उद्योग धन्धों को

वास्तव में कुछ विकास देने के लिये और उनकी तरक्की करने के लिये और उनकी उन्नति के लिये उनका क्या ऐक्टिव हाथ होगा यह इस बिल में कुछ नहीं दिखायी पड़ता है। जिस तरह से बिल्ली चूहे के साथ खेलना चाहती है उस तरह का खेल कूद तो इस में दिखायी पड़ता है, छेड़खानी तो आप करते हुए मालूम पड़ते हैं। अगर कोई शिकायत होती है तो उसके मामले में गवर्नमेंट फ़ौरन अपने इंसपैक्टरों के ज़रिये से और अपनी मैशीनरी के ज़रिये से आ कूदेगी, यह तो सही बात है। और यह भी कर सकती है कि अगर कहीं कोई ज्यादा खराबी नज़र आवे तो उस काम को अपने हाथ में ले ले। उस काम को वह अपने हाथ में किस तरह ले लेगी और क्या उसके पास उन उद्योग धन्धों को चलाने के लिए मैशीनरी है ? उसकी मैशीनरी में कोई ऐक्सपीरिऐंस्ड हैंड्स नहीं होंगे। जो पुराने आई० सी० ऐस० के लोग थे वह हर मर्ज़ का इलाज थे। जैसे ही सरकार ने एक सैक्रेटरी को रखा और उन्होंने अपने हाथ में चार्ज लिया और उसी दिन मजदूरों की सारी दिक्कतें दूर हो गईं और उद्योग धंधे उसी परिमाण में चलते रहेंगे। यह तरीका तो सफाई के साथ दिखायी नहीं पड़ता। गवर्नमेंट ने चन्द दिनों से यह बिल बनाया है। उसका कहां कहां उपयोग हुआ है, कहां क्या सफलता मिली है और कितने परिमाण में नहीं मिली है, इसका कोई अनुभव नहीं है। इसके अतिरिक्त पहले ऐक्ट में जो एक सीमा थी, उसमें यह लिखा था कि अगर बिजनेस एक लाख से ज्यादा होगी तो उसी मामले में सरकार कुछ हस्तक्षेप या देखरेख करेगी। अब उस सीमा को हटा दिया है। अब उद्योग धन्धों में पूंजी की कोई लिमिट नहीं रही है। और अब तक निरीक्षण में आने वाले जो उद्योग धन्धे थे उनकी सीमा अलबत्ता और बढ़ गयी है। कुछ सिल्क इंडस्ट्री इसमें आ गयी है, कुछ काटन का काम आ गया है और कुछ और चीज़ें आ गयी हैं। तो पांच ६ इंडस्ट्रीज़ इसमें और जोड़ दी गयी हैं। काम का विस्तार दोनों तरफ से कर दिया गया है। एक तरफ छोटी छोटी पूंजी लगा कर जो इंडस्ट्रीज़ चल रही हैं उन में भी सरकार निरीक्षण करने के लिए, नियंत्रण करने के लिए और मदाखिलत बेजा करने के लिए, इस विचार से हाज़िर है कि हम जनता के हित में यह कर रहे हैं। जनता के हित में काम करने का जोश तो आज बहुत है मगर इस बात को भी देखना आवश्यक है कि फ़ाइव ईयर प्लान में आपने प्राइवेट सैक्टर को एक महत्व दिया है और यहां पर इस तरह के बिल वगैरह पास करके हम उस प्राइवेट सैक्टर को पनपने ही नहीं देते हैं। उनके मन पर से यह शंका जाती ही नहीं कि गवर्नमेंट यहां आ टपकेगी। दो विचारों के लोग इस भवन में बैठे हुए हैं। एक का दिल यह कहता है कि हर चीज़ में परिवर्तन हो जाय, हर चीज़ का राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाय। हर चीज़ के ऊपर शासन व्यवस्था का पूरा अधिकार हो जाय। ऐसे विचार के लोगों को इंसपिरेशन और प्रेरणा मिलती है बाहर के कुछ ऐसे देशों से जहां पर सरकार ने सब चीज़ों पर अपना अधिकार कर लिया है और वही उद्योगधंधों को चलाती है वही कृषि उद्योग को चलाती है। तो वहां से उनको वह प्रेरणा मिलती है। लेकिन हमने अपना एक संविधान बनाया है। उस संविधान में और अपनी पंचवर्षीय योजना में, जिस पंच वर्षीय योजना को आज व्यापारी वर्ग ने भी समर्थन दिया है, हमने जो कुछ लिखा है उसकी आज बिल्कुल उपेक्षा की जा रही है और ऐसी योजना लाते हैं जिसमें यह लगे कि आप क्या समझते हैं कि क्या हम कोई प्रतिक्रियावादी हैं, क्या हम उद्योगों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने में सब से आगे चलने

[श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री]

वाले नहीं हैं। इस जोश में हम व्यावहारिकता की उपेक्षा करते हैं और उन्हीं नारों से हम भी प्रेरणा लेने लगते हैं जो नारे हमारे इधर बैठे हुए कुछ भाई देते हैं। कल जब हवाई जहाजों की कम्पनियों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का बिल आया था तो मैं उस पर केवल एक बात को सामने रखकर कुछ कहना चाहता था। इस दल में जितने लोग बैठे हैं उनमें मैं श्रीमती रेणु चक्रवर्ती को अधिक विचारशील पाता हूं। उनके भाषण को मैं ने बड़े ध्यान से सुना। उन्होंने कहा कि कम्पेन्सेशन की बात कैसे आती है। कम्पेनसेशन की बात ऐसे आती है कि संविधान में जहां पर मौलिक अधिकारों का प्रश्न आया है, जहां पर सम्पत्ति से सम्बन्ध रखने वाली धारायें हैं उन धाराओं में साफ तौर से लिखा है कि अगर हम किसी चीज को, किसी इंडस्ट्री को ले लें या किसी और सम्पत्ति को ले लें तो उसके लिए कोई न कोई क्षतिपूर्ति का प्रबन्ध किया जायगा, बिना क्षतिपूर्ति के वह नहीं ली जायगी। हम सब ने यहां पर संविधान के प्रति लायल रहने की शपथ ली है। संविधान में जो बातें मान ली गई हैं अगर उनकी उपेक्षा कर के हम भाषण दें तो उससे यही प्रतीत होगा कि हमने शपथ जो खायी है वह एक कागज के पुलिन्दे के प्रति खायी है उसके प्रति हमारी कोई आस्था नहीं है। लेकिन हम को इस बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि उसमें क्या लिखा है। हमारी सोसाइटी का ढांचा क्या है, और उस ढांचे के प्रति हमारी कुछ आस्था है या नहीं।

चाहे यह हमारा दोषपूर्ण सामाजिक जीवन हो, राजनीतिक जीवन हो, और आर्थिक जीवन हो, लेकिन यह बातें हम कह चुके हैं कि हम यहां पर प्राइवेट सैक्टर को भी मानते हैं। लोग अपने उद्योग धंधे व्यक्तिगत रूप से एक कम्पनी बना कर, संघ बना कर, सोसायटी बना कर चला सकते हैं और उन को उस के करने का अधिकार होगा। तो सरकार उस में कितना प्रोत्साहन देती है, कितना उस के बढ़ाने के लिये काम करती है इस चीज को हम देखना चाहते हैं। तो इस तरह के उद्योग धन्धों को विकास देने वाले विधेयक को हम पढ़ें तो उसकी झांकी हम को मिलनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि सरकार इसमें असमर्थ है कि वह छोटे से छोटे उद्योग धन्धों को अपने कंट्रोल में और नियंत्रण में ले कर उनका प्रबन्ध कर सके। उनके प्रबन्ध में कोई कमी पावे तो उन पर अपना अधिकार जमा ले और उसका प्रबन्ध फ़ौरन हो जाय, यह मुश्किल होगा। अगर सरकार के बीच में और उद्योग धंधों के चलाने वाले के बीच में झगड़े होते तो यह आसान होता और सरकार अधिकार करती। उद्योग धंधों को नष्ट करने वाली दूसरी जमातें भी मौजूद हैं, चाहे काम वहां अच्छा भी चलता हो, क्योंकि क्रान्ति का नारा देने वाले और मजदूरों को चैन से न बैठने देने वाले, सरकार के काम को उलझाने वाले लोग मौजूद हैं। उस के लिये वे स्ट्राइक करवाते हैं। छोटी छोटी बातें रख कर लोगों को भड़का देते हैं। तो फिर उस के आधार पर सरकार के पास शिकायतें आवेंगी और इन आधारों के होते हुए सरकार को उस में हस्तक्षेप करना पड़ेगा। मैं नहीं समझता कि सरकार के पास आज इतनी बड़ी योजना है कि इन सारे कामों को हाथ में ले कर वह चला सके। और फिर इससे तो उत्पादन ही घटेगा, बढ़ेगा नहीं, इस का मुझे भय है। इसलिये धारा ४ की समाप्ति की व्यावहारिकता और उस का महत्व मेरी समझ में नहीं आया। क्योंकि यह विधेयक प्रवर समिति के सामने जायगा, इसलिये मैं इस आशा और विश्वास से बोल रहा हूं कि वहां

पर इस के ऊपर अच्छी तरह विचार कर लिया जायगा कि सरकार कितनी बड़ी जिम्मेदारी अपने ऊपर ले रही है ।

मैं सरकार के लिये समझता हूं कि वह रक्षण दे, शिक्षण दे, और पालन पोषण की व्यवस्था करे । यह तीन तो उसके मुख्य काम हैं । मगर सारे व्यापारिक उद्योग धन्धों के काम को अपना कर एक बनिया गवर्नमेंट बनने की वह चेष्टा करे यह बात मुझ को कुछ बहुत मुनासिब नहीं मालूम होती । मैं जो शासन का रूप समझता हूं उस में यह नहीं समझता कि यह हर चीज़ को अपने हाथ में कर ले । यातायात की बात दूसरी है । रेल का मामला अलग है, हवाई जहाज़ की बात अलग है । उस पर तो सरकार अधिक से अधिक कंट्रोल और उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण करे । लेकिन एक तरफ प्राइवेट सैक्टर की बात भी कहते जाना और दूसरी तरफ उस के रास्ते में हर जगह छेड़खानी करना, यह कहां तक ठीक है । और वह छेड़खानी भी कहां तक कि पहले तो बिल्ली खेलती थी घूस के साथ या बड़े बड़े मोटे चूहों के साथ कि जिनकी लिमिट एक लाख रुपये से कम नहीं थी, और आज अब वह नन्ही नन्ही चुहियों के साथ खेलने के लिये भी आमादा है । तो इस से उद्योग धन्धे चलाने वालों को कहां तक प्रोत्साहन होगा कि वह पैसा लगावें, सर मग्ज करें और हर क़दम पर इंस्पैक्टर साहब मौजूद हैं । वे हर जगह शिकायत सुनने को मौजूद हैं । ऐसा करने के क्या मानी हैं, कि लोगों को बिदकाना ।

मुझे याद है कि बचपन में मधुमक्खी अपना छत्ता लगाने के लिये आती थीं । पहले रानी बैठी और उस ने जरा हरकत की और थोड़ा सा छत्ता लगाया । वह हमें दिखाई पड़ा कि हम मसखरे लोग उस पर छेड़खानी करते और वह वहां से भाग जाती थीं । बरैया का छत्ता हो तो मैं समझ सकता हूं कि उस से शहद भी कुछ मिलेगा । लेकिन एक जरा सा छत्ता लगा है, उस के साथ इस तरह से मसखरापन करना कहां तक उचित है कि जरा सा भी शहद नहीं बनने दिया जाय । हम जानते हैं कि पुरानी साम्राज्यशाही में कोई कैपिटल फ़ार्मेशन नहीं हुआ । यहां की जनता में कोई अर्थ संग्रह नहीं हुआ । कोई बड़ी पूंजी बन नहीं पाई और अब यह धीरे धीरे पनपने की जो बातें शुरू हुई तो उस पर हम ने प्रारम्भ में ही खेल शुरू कर दिया । उस के साथ प्रारम्भ में ही छेड़खानी शुरू कर दी । इस तरह से हम न तो अपने राष्ट्र की सम्पत्ति में इजाफ़ा करते हैं और नहीं हम अपने क्लीयर माइन्डेडनैस का सबूत देते हैं । क्या हम सचमुच इस तरह से तानाशाही में विश्वास करते हैं या हम विश्वास करते हैं प्रजातंत्र में । यदि हम प्रजातंत्र में विश्वास करते हैं तो हमें लोगों को जीवित रहने का अधिकार देना चाहिये । आप उन के साथ हर हर क़दम पर छेड़खानी न कीजिये और यह छेड़खानी कम से कम कीजिये । और फिर यदि तानाशाही में विश्वास है तो एक बार खुले तौर पर हम को आना चाहिये । आज जनता में और लोगों में धीरे धीरे अविश्वास सा बढ़ता जाता है । गवर्नमेंट की स्पष्ट नीति उन के सामने नहीं आती । वह अर्द्धजली लकड़ी की तरह है, आधी लकड़ी जली है और आधी लकड़ी क़ायम है । आज लोगों के समझ में नहीं आता कि हमारी सरकार हम को आगे बढ़ने देगी या नहीं । हम जो उद्योग धन्धे चला रहे हैं उस में हमारे लिये सरकार कुछ सहायता करेगी या नहीं । उस के लिये जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं वे हाकिम बन कर और अधिकारी बन कर खाली रोब जमाने के लिये और कुछ आतंक जमाने के लिये हैं या किसी और काम के लिये हैं । यदि केवल रोब जमाना और

[श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री]

आतंक जमाना ही काम है तो मैं नहीं समझता कि इस से उद्योग धंधों का कोई विकास हो सकता है ।

मैं अभी माननीय मंत्री से पूर्वी जिलों के बारे में जिक्र कर रहा था कि वहां उत्तर प्रदेश में कोई उद्योग धन्धे नहीं चलते । कोई पूंजीपति वहां इनवैस्ट नहीं करता । वहां रेह काफी मिलती है तो वहां इस तरह पर कोई सोप बनने का ही कारखाना अगर बन जाय तो भी कुछ काम चले । वहां उस क्षेत्र में कोई पूंजी कैसे लगावे इसकी जांच करने की आवश्यकता है । मैं माननीय मंत्रीजी से निवेदन करूंगा कि एक बार वे उत्तर प्रदेश के उन पूर्वी जिलों का दौरा करें और वहां की परिस्थिति को देखें कि वहां क्या आवश्यकता है, क्या चीजें वहां पनप सकती हैं, कौन से उद्योग धन्धे वहां पनप सकते हैं । उन के पनपने के लिये वह कोई काम करें । यदि यह काम वह इस ऐक्ट के मुताबिक़ कर सकें, इस विधेयक के मुताबिक़ कर सकें तो मैं उन को बधाई दूंगा । महज एक चेतावनी के रूप में मैं ने कहा कि ऐसा न हो कि हम जो उत्तरदायित्व अपने ऊपर ले रहे हैं वह बहुत भारी साबित हो और दूसरे लोग जो इंटरैस्टैड पार्टी हैं उद्योग धन्धों को पैरैलाइज करने में, इस में जिनकी दिलचस्पी है और जो सरकार के रास्ते में कठिनाइयां पैदा करना अपना परम कर्त्तव्य मानते हैं और जो मजदूरी बढ़ाने के नारे दे कर और दूसरे नारे दे कर लड़ाई के क्षेत्र को और व्यापक न बना देवें, यह भय है । इस से केवल बड़े बड़े उद्योग धन्धे ही समाप्त नहीं हो जावेंगे, छोटे छोटे उद्योग धन्धे भी अब समाप्त हो जावेंगे । इस लिये मेरा विश्वास है कि माननीय मंत्री इस बात पर अवश्य विचार करेंगे । मैं केवल इसी भावना से प्रेरित हो कर यह कह रहा हूं, क्योंकि मैं जब देखता हूं कि संविधान की मौलिक धाराओं की उपेक्षा कर के ऐक्सप्रोप्रियेशन की तरफ़ हमारा ध्यान जाता है, सम्पत्ति को छीन लेने की तरफ़ हमारा ध्यान जाता है, जो केवल राष्ट्रीयकरण तक ही सीमित नहीं है, राष्ट्र के हाथ में अधिकार देने की ही भावना नहीं है, तो मैं यह निवेदन कर रहा हूं । कुछ लोगों के इस प्रकार के विचार हैं, कुछ लोगों की ऐसी भावना है कि जिसका ओरीजिन बिल्कुल बाहर का है । उस को ले कर हम अपने राष्ट्रीय विचारों के अनुसार समाज को रहने देना नहीं चाहते तो यह चेतावनी देना मेरे लिये आवश्यक हो गया है, वरना इस बिल पर मुझे बोलने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी ।

तो यह दो बातें मैं ने कहीं । हमारे पूर्वी जिलों की हालत को देखना और वहां उद्योग धन्धों को पनपने देने के लिये आवश्यक है कि वहां सरकार क्या क्या उस के लिये योग दे सकती है । उत्तर प्रदेश के उन पूर्वी जिलों में करोड़ों लोगों की आबादी है हमारे वहां कोई मुख्य उद्योग धन्धा है तो केवल हैंडलूम के चरखे का उद्योग है । तो उद्योग धन्धों को विकसित करने का जो इस विधेयक का उद्देश्य है, इसलिये वहां भी उद्योग धंधों को विकसित करने की माननीय मंत्री चेष्टा करें, यह मेरा निवेदन है ।

पंडित के० सी० शर्मा (जिला मेरठ—दक्षिण) : मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूं । मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य है कि मेरे मित्र पंडित अलगू राय जी ने बहुत सी ऐसी बातें उठाईं जिनका इस से कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । मुझे यह भी आश्चर्य है कि अलगू राय जी, अब जबकि बीसवीं सदी का आधा हिस्सा पूरा हो चुका है, यह समझ बैठे हैं कि यदि किसी आदमी के नाम बक में तीन करोड़ रुपये हैं

तो मान लिया जाय कि वह आमदनी और वह रुपया आसमान से उस के घर में आ टपका है। मैं तो समझता हूं कि यह समाज के बल पर काम करने से एक आदमी के हाथ में आता है और समाज का यह अधिकार है कि समाज के हित के लिये उसका इस्तेमाल किया जाय। यदि कोई मनुष्य ऐसा नहीं करता तो वह समाज के प्रति पाप करता है। और यदि कोई सरकार उस को बरदाश्त करती है तो वह उस पाप में हाथ बंटाती है। हमारे देश में जब कि लाखों आदमी बेरोज़गार हैं, जबकि औरतों को पहिनने के लिये कपड़ा नसीब नहीं होता हो, जब कि लोगों को खाने के लिये रोटी न मिलती हो, जब कि बीमारों को दवा मयस्सर न हो, उस हालत में यह सोचना कि एक आदमी इस तरह पैदा कर के इतना धन कमा ले और उस को दाद-इलाही जायदाद समझ लिया जाय, यह पाप से कुछ कम नहीं है।

श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री : बस, सरकारी इंस्पैक्टर के सुपुर्द कर दिया जाय ?

पंडित के० सी० शर्मा : सरकारी इंस्पैक्टर सरकार का एक नुमायन्दा है और वह सरकारी इन्स्पैक्टर व्यक्तिगत रूप से उस काम को नहीं करता, बल्कि आप के हुक्म के मातहत जनता के हित में काम को देखता है। किसी न किसी मनुष्य पर तो आप को ऐतबार करना ही पड़ेगा। आप यहां कैसे नुमायन्दे बन कर बैठे हैं, हम सब लोग यहां कैसे बैठे हैं ? कांग्रेस का प्रैसीडेंट हम को नामिनेट करता है। जनता पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू में विश्वास रखते हुए और हमारे कारनामों को देखते हुए हमें यहां भेजती है। हमारा कौन फ़िर अधिक हक़ हो जाता है।

इंसपैक्टर को उसकी कैपिसिटी और उसकी क़ाबलियत के आधार पर नौकरी मिल जाती है। तो जो बात मैं कह रहा था वह यह कि यदि यह उसूल मान लिया गया कि जो उद्योग धंधे हैं इनको जनता के हित में चलाना है और यदि कोई ऐसी फ़ैक्टरी या मिल है जो जनता के हित में नहीं चल रही है, और इन्तज़ाम की ख़राबी या दूसरे अन्य झगड़ों की बिना पर टूटी जा रही है और उसका सुधार नहीं हो सकता है तो सरकार का यह कर्त्तव्य है कि उसको अपने हाथ में ले ले। पहले जो क़ानून था उसमें ऐसा कोई अख़्तियार व अधिकार नहीं था ताकि सरकार द्वारा उस मिल या फ़ैक्टरी को अपने हाथ में ले कर ठीक से उसको क़ायम किया जा सके और चलाया जा सके। पहले क़ानून में जो यह कमी थी, उसको इस नये बिल में पूरा किया गया है। इसके अलावा इसमें कोई और नई चीज़ नहीं बढ़ायी गयी है, बल्कि उस पहले क़ानून का जो आशय था उसकी पूर्ति के लिए इस मौजूदा बिल में कुछ अधिकार दिये गये हैं। पहले के क़ानून में जो कमी थी, वह दूर हो सके, इसके अलावा इस बिल में और कोई नयी चीज़ नहीं रक्खी गयी है। मूल सिद्धान्त यह मान लिया गया है कि अगर किसी व्यक्ति विशेष के पास कोई सम्पत्ति हो तो आज वायुमंडल ऐसा बन गया है कि जिसमें उस सम्पत्ति का इस्तेमाल जनता के हित में ही हो सकता है, उसको इस बात का अधिकार नहीं है कि उस सम्पत्ति का वह जनता के अहित में इस्तेमाल कर सके। यह मूल सिद्धान्त स्वीकार कर लिया गया कि कोई भी कारोबार हो वह जनता के हित में होना चाहिये और जिस परिस्थिति में आज हम रह रहे हैं, उस परिस्थिति में यह अत्यावश्यक है कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा हम काम करें और ज्यादा से ज्यादा पैदा करें और अधिक से अधिक सुन्दर वस्तु पैदा कर सकें, ज्यादा पैदा करें और ज्यादा अच्छी पैदा कर सकें और अगर कोई उद्योग ऐसा नहीं करता तो सरकार को वहां हस्तक्षेप करने का अधिकार हो जाता है। पहले कानून में ऐसी गुंजायश

[पंडित० के० सी० शर्मा]

नहीं थी । वह चीज इस नये बिल में की गई है और इसके अलावा इसमें और कोई नयी बढ़ोत्तरी नहीं है ।

दूसरे जहां तक क़ीमत मुक़र्रर करने का सवाल है, मैं समझता हूं कि क़ीमत मुक़र्रर करने का अधिकार अत्यावश्यक है । इसके विरुद्ध यहां पर यह तर्क पेश किया गया है कि एसेंशियल सप्लाई ऐक्ट के अन्दर हमको क़ीमत नियत करने का अधिकार मिला हुआ है और इसलिए इस बिल में यह अधिकार रखने की जरूरत नहीं है । मैं उनको बतलाऊं कि एसेंशियल सप्लाई ऐक्ट में जिन मूल सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर यह चीज की जाती है वे दूसरे हैं और जिन मूल सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर यह अधिकार इस बिल में दिया जा रहा है, वे दूसरे हैं । दूसरे एसेंशियल सपलाई ऐक्ट के मातहत एक चीज जो जरूरी हो और जिसकी कमी हो और आम ग़रीब आदमी उस को खरीद नहीं सकता हो, तो जनता के इस्तैमाल के लिए उसकी क़ीमत मक़र्रर कर दी जाती है, लेकिन उसमें यह सवाल नहीं उठता कि वह चीज पैदा होगी या नहीं होगी, और वह चीज एक एकोनामिक प्रापोजीशन है या नहीं (आर्थिक दृष्टि से ठीक है अथवा नहीं) । इस क़ानून के मातहत एक चीज की क़ीमत इसलिए मुक़र्रर की जायगी ताकि उसका डवलपमेंट, बढ़ोत्तरी और उस का ज्यादा प्रोडक्शन कायम रह सके । मान लीजिये कि कुछ फ़ैक्टरीज हैं, वे मिल कर एक क़ीमत मुक़र्रर कर लेती हैं, और थोड़ा पैदा करती हैं तो जहां उनकी आमदनी बराबर बढ़ती रहेगी और नफ़ा मिलता रहेगा, वहां जनता का नुक़सान होता रहेगा और देश को हानि पहुंचेगी, इसलिए कि माल कम आयगा । मान लीजिए कुछ मोटर बनाने वाली फ़ैक्टरीज यह तय करें कि हमको पन्द्रह हजार कम से कम क़ीमत रखनी है, तो नतीजा यह होगा कि कम पैदा करने पर भी फैक्टरीज को बराबर नफ़ा होता रहेगा, लेकिन जनता के हाथ में उतनी चीजें नहीं आयेंगी, उतनी मोटरें नहीं आयेंगी जितने की जनता को आवश्यकता है और इस तरह जनता और देश को हानि पहुंचेगी । इसलिए इस कानून में जिन मूल सिद्धान्तों के आधार पर यह अधिकार लिया गया है वे दूसरे हैं और इसका लिया जाना बहुत जरूरी था । जैसा कि डाक्टर श्यामा प्रसाद मुकर्जी ने कहा, यह अधिकार अत्यावश्यक था । मैं उनसे पूर्ण रूप से सहमत हूं ।

एक सवाल, जैसा कि श्री अलगूराय ने कहा, यह है कि छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे भी हम अपने हाथ में ले लेंगे, मैं समझता हूं कि हम लोगों को यह समझ लेना चाहिए कि जो लोग काम कर रहे हैं उन के दिमाग़ में भी कुछ अक्ल बाक़ी है । कोई भी मिनिस्टर दस, बीस या पचास हज़ार का धंधा अपने हाथ में नहीं लेगा । सरकार तो बड़ी बड़ी फैक्टरियों और मिलों में ही हस्तक्षेप करेगी, छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों में वह हस्तक्षेप नहीं करेगी और मैं समझता हूं कि हमारे जो उद्योग मंत्री हैं उनमें काफ़ी सूझबूझ है और उस बारे में किसी को सन्देह करने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

एक सवाल के बारे में मुझे और कहना है और वह यह कि इसमे जो मुक़दमा चलाने के सम्बन्ध में धारा रक्खी गयी है वह यह है कि सरकारी कर्मचारी ही मुक़दमा चला सकता है और अदालत में वही पेश कर सकता है कि इस क़ानून के विरुद्ध कोई जुर्म हुआ ? मैं समझता हूं यह ग़लत है । फैक्टरीज या मिलों में जो जुर्म होते हैं और जो क़ानून के विरुद्ध कार्रवाई होती है उन्हें ज्यादातर वही लोग जानते हैं जो फैक्टरी में काम करते हैं और उनसे मिले जुले रहते हैं ।

सरकारी कर्मचारियों का बहुत ज़माने से यही काम समझा गया है कि अगर पबलिक आर्डर में, रोज के अमनोअमान में, खलल या झगड़ा न पड़े, तो वे बहुधा हस्तक्षेप नहीं करते । इसलिये यदि आप इसके मुताबिक़ काम करना चाहते हैं तो आप को यह अधिकार देना पड़ेगा कि जनता का हर एक आदमी इस कानून के खिलाफ जो कार्रवाई की गयी हो, उसके खिलाफ अदालत में मुक़दमा चला सके ताकि लोगों को यह मालूम हो कि वह जो कुछ करते हैं आम आदमी उसको देखता है और उसकी ज़वाबदेही भी उन को करनी पड़ेगी । इन शब्दों के साथ मैं समाप्त करता हूं ।

Shri Damodara Menon (Kozhikode): I extend my general support to the provisions of this Bill because every attempt on the part of the Government to bring the private sector under stricter control and to make the vested interests in this country play their part in the economic life of the nation must be welcomed.

Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand whom I do not find here now, grew poetic under the stress of this Bill. I welcome this because a bit more of imagination on the part of the industrialists of this country would help them to adjust themselves to the changing times. In his speech he criticised the attitude of labour and he said many of the ills in the private sector of our industry are due to the recalcitrant attitude and unhelpful methods adopted by labour. I have been a labour worker for some time, and I would like to ask the industrialists of our country whether they have played their part fairly with labour. In many cases they have been trying to exploit labour in the most unscrupulous manner. Whenever a labour dispute arises, if we go to the bottom of it, we will always find the mistake lies more with industrialists than with the labour. Are the industrialists of our country willing to treat labour as equal partners in a national endeavour?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): No, no.

Shri Damodara Menon: Are they willing to share profits with them, and are they also willing to democratise the industrial set-up? If they are unwilling to do all that, you cannot expect labour to play their part well. Therefore, Mr. Kilachand and the industrialists of our country, when they throw a stone at labour, must also realize that the difficulties they experience in dealing with labour are due to their own fault, and so long as they persist in his method, it will not be possible for them to have industrial peace.

The hon. Minister referred to section 18A, which has been introduced now in the Bill, as an amendment of the original section 17, which gives power to the Government to take over the management of industries which are not functioning to the national interest. The hon. member Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee said that the Government must be very careful of the agency they employ for the conduct of these concerns, once they are taken over. That is a very important matter, because if the agency they employ for the conduct of the industrial undertakings that they take over is defective, then the people will generally blame the Government and also the policy of control. There has been, of late, a lot of criticism on the part of many members of this House about the manner in which Government are managing the undertakings they have under their direct control. There has been criticism that there is wastage, nepotism, and inefficiency. There is a lot of truth in that and everybody knows that. But I am amused to find the private sector, especially the industrialists quoting this, as if this is a reason to show that Government should not undertake any industrial undertaking in this country. They seem to think that because in some cases Government have failed, the Government machinery has not been properly functioning, and so everything must be left to the private sector. This is a wrong attitude. People have been able to focus their attention on undertakings run by the Government, because they are public concerns. And many of the defects have been brought to light about them. But what about the private sector? If you analyse the private sector and probe into their defects, you will find huge scandals, glaring instances where there has been a lot of corruption, and also mismanagement. These things are brought to light only occasionally, when a private undertaking fails or when there has been great fraud. But in a Government undertaking, very often, people have tried to examine these things more openly. So, let us not run to the conclusion that merely because there have been some failings on the part of the Government undertakings, everything must be left to

[Shri Damodara Menon]

the private sector, and that the private sector is all well. I am saying this only to show that the private sector should not exploit these failures and make a claim that they must remain and have control over the industries of our country.

I was at the point of having proper management of these undertakings. In this connection, I would urge upon the hon. Minister to see that labour is properly represented in the management. The hon. Minister himself said that it may become necessary for the Government to take over an industry when there is a labour dispute which paralyses the industry. In all these things, if we trust the labour and the workers, especially the technicians who run the industry, it will be possible for the Government to find the actual personnel who will undertake the responsibility of running the concern on behalf of the Government. Very often, when they have an agency, they depend upon the industrialists themselves. These industrialists have no faith in the Government's policy. They think that it would be better if everything were left to their own management. I do not want to reflect on the conduct of any industrialist here, but I would say that probably it may be to their private interest to see that these concerns which the Government take over do not succeed. Therefore, if you put people who have no faith in the Government's policy, as managers of these enterprises, when they are taken over by government, then I am sure, there will be failure. It becomes all the more necessary, therefore, for the Government to see that people who have faith in their policy and people who stand to benefit by the Government managing an industry, are given management or at least a share in the management of these undertakings. So, when the Government think of appointing an agency to run the industrial undertaking, I hope the hon. Minister will see that labour is properly represented in the management.

It has been our experience that whenever the Government have come forward to ask for more powers to bring private industrialists under control, this House has never grudged giving those powers to the Government. But in the implementation of the legislative powers they have got, we find that very often they fail, because they are half-hearted. They speak brave words here. They say that the Government will see that industrial undertakings, especially those in the private sector are run for the advantage of the nation as a whole, and not for the private profit of any particular industrialist. They say all that and yet, in spite of that, they are very reluctant to use the powers they have got, in the proper manner. I would therefore urge on the hon. Minister to see that the powers which he will get as a result of this amending Bill, are used strictly, with a view to see that the private sector plays its part properly in our national life. The hon. Minister stated that whenever any disputes arise between the industrialists and labour, the Government would step in. But I want to ask the hon. Minister whether this will be the only case where they will exercise the powers that they get as a result of this enactment.

What is the test that an industry is run for the benefit of the nation, and that the industrialist is not exploiting for his own personal benefit? The hon. Minister's assurance that the Government will use these powers only sparingly gives room for doubt that probably the Government may be very soft on these industrialists.

I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister some specific instances. We have allowed foreign enterprise to come and develop here. The other day, questions were asked in the House, as to the number of persons employed, and the number of Indians employed in these foreign concerns. And the hon. Minister gave some figures, and he said that some foreign concerns have refused to send proper replies to the Government. And when he was asked what steps he proposed to take in this connection, he said that the Government would take every step that they were competent to take. Now I want to ask the hon. Minister, whether in cases where the foreign industrialists here are reluctant to obey the directions given by the Government, and to employ Indians in their firms in larger numbers, the Government will consider the application of the provisions of this enactment. There are many foreign concerns in this country, which, especially after independence, have pursued a policy of importing a large number of foreigners, especially young men with no experience at all, and have put them over the head of Indian employees. This matter has been brought to the notice of the hon. Minister earlier also. I want to know whether in such cases the Government will see that these foreign establishments here serve the national interests, and that they give opportunities for Indians to learn the know-how of the thing, and also

give them responsible posts, in those concerns where there has been failure on the part of the foreign industrialists to comply with the policy of the Government. I want to know whether in those cases, the hon. Minister will exercise the powers he is going to get under this enactment, to see that those concerns are taken over and managed by the Government. I hope, that if the hon. Minister embarks on a policy like that, this measure would have justified itself.

Mr. Chairman: Before I call upon the next speaker, may I say that the hon. Minister will reply at 12-45 and there is not very much time. May I ask all the hon. Members to be kindly as brief as possible?

Shri Bansal (Jhajjar-Rewari): I am sure the House would be grateful to the hon. Member, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, for having brought a sense of realism in this debate which, unfortunately, had been taken to the other world of China by my hon. friend. the other Mukerjee. He has roamed on a wide field from China to steel industry and then to aluminium industry and what not. His oratory and some of the facts and half-facts which he weaves in that oratory cause deception in the minds of many of us. I am sure the House has not forgotten that only the other day the Prime Minister had asked as to why he did not place the relative figures rather than quoting any percentages. And the House is still awaiting the figures which Shri Mukerjee promised to place before it.

Speaking about the steel industry, he said that it was the industrialists themselves who were not allowing its development. I here and now say that industry has been most anxious and has been telling Government again and again that new plants must be put up in the country for increasing the production of steel. It is the Government's failure, and not that of private enterprise, which is responsible for its low production in this industry. Do we not know that Government have decided to put up these factories under their own control? The additional plants are no longer with private enterprise. Then he again referred to the Indian Aluminium company. May I inform him that Government do not give any subsidy to the aluminium industry now, and further that when granting permission to the Indian Aluminium recently for expanding their capacity Government have told them that they will have to shift their plant from South India to a place nearer to where the raw material is being produced? So, I do not know why the hon. Member should be ladling these half-facts before this House.

He takes the hon. Minister to task for what? For assuring this House that this Bill is not a measure for nationalisation. This Bill is not a measure for nationalisation. We had another measure for nationalisation only two days ago—nationalisation of civil aviation in this country. Whenever Government want to nationalise any industry, they will bring forward similar Bills. I am sure the hon. Member was here listening to the speech of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee which brought out in a very clear manner as to what is the object of this Bill. Not that I agree with everything that has been proposed in this Bill, but it is clear that the purpose of this Bill is quite different from that of nationalisation. And it was but proper that the Minister should have come with a statement to that effect and allayed the fears of those people who might be labouring under the same type of misapprehension as my hon. friend, that this Bill intends nationalisation. The intention of this Bill is to correct a lacuna which was left in the previous Act in certain matters.

Before I come to that, I will refer to one point which was made out by the hon. Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee. He said that Government should take further powers under this Bill or by amending the Indian Companies Act to take over any industry the production of which was falling. Now, I can understand if he had qualified that remark by saying that Government should make provision to take over such industries whose production was falling and which were absolutely necessary in the interests of the nation There are a number of industries the production of which goes up and goes down because of the demand factor in the country. Do we not know that even the ordnance factories of Government are not able to work to full capacity? Do we not know that there are a number of other industries in the country which cannot produce to their full capacity because the demand is not there? I am one with him if he says that demand must be created, that the purchasing power of the people must be raised and the standard of living of the people should be increased so that everything that we need is produced here and every man that we can employ to produce the things we need can be employed. Then I would have understood the point.

12 NOON

Now, I would come to my hon. friend, Mr. Hiren Mukerjee. He

[Shri Bansal]

said that there ought to have been something in this Bill so that the area of Government's activity would be enlarged and Government should have taken more powers to see that nationalisation came at the earliest possible moment. This very House has adopted the first Five Year Plan. And what does this Five Year Plan say about nationalisation? I will just quote two sentences from this report. They say:

> "Private enterprise operating in terms of legitimate profit expectations and the efficient use of available resources has an important part to play in developing the country. The scope and need for development are so great that it is best for the public sector to develop those industries in which private enterprise is unable or unwilling to put up the resources required and run the risks involved, leaving the rest of the field for free enterprise".

Then they again say:

> "Nationalisation of the existing enterprises, which means acquisition by Government of the existing productive assets, has, in our view, only a low priority"—mark the words 'low priority'—"especially as most of the purposes of such a transfer of ownership can be served by judicious regulation. In a planned economy, the justification of private enterprise is there and within the framework of national policy it is capable of contributing to the fulfilment of the objectives defined in the plan".

And this Bill of the hon. the Commerce Minister is trying to achieve the objectives which have been laid down in these sentences in this Plan. But I am sorry I have also to enter a caveat against the Minister himself. He said that we had to take this power because we have to guard against all possible contingencies where private enterprise did not function properly. I would have very much wished that he would have been more pragmatic in his approach rather than theoretical, rather than idealistic. Because what has happened during these last few years? At least within this one year there has been only one case—of one small industry—where Government found it necessary to have a semblance of power to take that concern over. And even that concern did not have to be taken over because it promised to mend matters. Now, with that background, I am not quite sure as to why the hon. the Commerce Minister was in such a hurry to amend this Act, because I am one of those who believe that it is always better to get the co-operation of whomsoever we want—it may be labour, it may be industry, it may be Government officials—by persuasion and by convincing them that it is in the best interests of their own and of the nation that they should play their part properly. I am sure the Commerce Minister knows himself what change he has wrought within this one year. He did not have this amending Bill or the powers under this amending Bill with him by which he was able to bring about that change. That change was brought about by his approach to the industrialists, to the shareholders and to all the other elements including labour which go to make up an industry. If he had brought about that change, brought about that sense of responsiveness in the past by his approach, why is it necessary to take such stringent powers under this Bill now, particularly when only one case has occurred during a whole year when it was felt that some more powers would have to be taken by Government?

But now that the Bill has been brought before the House, I am not going to oppose it. But for his consideration I will place one or two points before the House. One is relating to the new section 18A(b) where it is said:

> "an industrial undertaking in respect of which an investigation has been made under section 15 (whether or not any directions have been issued to the undertaking in pursuance of section 16) is being managed in a manner...etc. etc."

The idea of this amendment is that an industrial undertaking, the affairs of which are found to be not going on all right, will be taken over by Government if Government so desire without giving that concern an opportunity to mend its ways. I would have very much liked that such an opportunity is given to the industrial concern. It may be that the investigation may disclose that the mistakes of the firm have been on very minor points. It may be that the firm itself may approach Government and say: 'Well, if you give us a chance, we shall show better results'. Then in such cases, I do not know why Government should take this power of taking over that concern, without giving that concern a chance to mend its ways. The existence of this power in my opinion has created some misgivings in the minds of people—not

necessarily of big industrialists, because my experience has been that big industrialists can always approach the Commerce Minister and the Ministries here, but also of small industrialists. After all, when we talk of industrialists and industry, we should not think only in terms of Tatas and Birlas and Dalmias. There are thousands of small industrialists in the country who run small factories. A power-loom owner is an industrialist, a ply-wood manufacturer having a capital of a few thousands of rupees is also an industrialist. Now, from my own personal experience I say that it is these smaller people who find the greatest difficulty in getting things done properly by the government departments. A bigger industrialist has got so many means, he has his liaison officers here and at very short notice they can always approach the officers and Ministers and get their grievances redressed. But, the smaller people have no such approach and, in fact, it is these who will be very much handicapped under this new amending Bill.

Similarly, another amendment is being made whereby any factory whose capital may be even less than a lakh of rupees, will have to apply for registration and licence. Here again, I am afraid, the same difficulty will be faced by the smaller units in industry. I am sure the hon. Commerce Minister will do something to allay the fear of the smaller and medium industrialists.

Then there is another point. It is mentioned in the new section 18A that Government may authorise any person or body of persons to take over the management. But, while taking over, all persons in charge of the management, including persons holding offices as managers or directors of the industrial undertaking immediately before the issue of the notified order shall be deemed to have vacated their offices as such. Now, in my opinion, the presence of this clause may be necessary; but, I want another clause here which may not be so drastic, but which may enable Government to take more lenient steps as a first measure towards mending the affairs of the erring industry concerned. For example, we have a case before us. The affairs of the Scindias were not going on according to the wishes of the Government of India. They did not take over the whole concern; they did not dispense with the managing agents; they did not dismiss the board of directors. They took a very simple measure and they sent one of their high officers from here to be in charge of the management. That is, he was appointed as a General Manager of that concern; and, I am sure, by that small change, Government have been able to bring the necessary corrective to one of the biggest concerns of our country. Why can we not have a provision here which will enable the Government to take such measures in future? It may be possible that by the simple substitution of one director in the board of directors or by replacing one managing director by a person of Government's choice or by appointing a manager, Government can get things done which they think can be done only under the new section 18B (a). I would earnestly request the hon. Commerce Minister not to have a closed mind on the subject but to consider this in all its implications and examine the possibility of introducing another clause which will make the powers of Government more flexible. I want that Government's power should not be whittled down at all, but they should be in the Act in such a form that they take those powers step by step and in a flexible manner so that the nervousness which may be there in the minds of the industry may be removed.

There is another suggestion which I want to make in regard to the new section 18A. Here it is mentioned that the Government's power to authorise a person to take over the industrial undertaking will be limited to a period specified in the order. Now, supposing the period is over and the Government think that even then it is necessary to continue control of that undertaking, then what is going to be the position? I would suggest that the Select Committee consider this point and either make an amendment here itself or authorise the Government under the rule-making powers to table a resolution before this House whenever the life of such a notification has to be extended.

Then, there are certain punitive clauses which have been more stringent under this amending Bill. My suggestion is that whenever a person goes on committing offences one after another, then, certainly, he must be punished most severely, but, when there is only a technical breach or when the breach is unintentional or the breach is such that it can be repaired easily, in such cases there should be a very lenient punishment, and, at least, there should be no vicarious liability. It is very easy to fix the liability on a person who is actually responsible for that breach and it is not necessary to foist that liability or responsibility

[Shri Bansal]

in a vicarious manner on persons who might have nothing to do with that particular offence.

With these words I would once again say that the record of the industry during the last two years has been very good indeed. That has been admitted by most Members in this House, not the least by the hon. Commerce Minister himself. Industry is showing a greater sense of responsiveness to whatever Government wants them to do and to the new shape of things in this country; and, therefore, it will not do, when we are just beginning to restore that confidence and to bring about that sense of responsiveness, to disturb the whole atmosphere by bringing in measures which are likely to have any adverse effect. Not that I see anything very wrong in this Bill, but if the amendments which I have proposed are accepted by the hon. Commerce Minister, I think the rigours of some of these amending clauses will be removed and whittled down.

* **श्री आर० डी० मिश्र** (ज़िला बुलंदशहर) : मैं खद्दर बिल पर बोलना चाहता था, पर मौक़ा नहीं मिला। आज इस बिल पर बोलने का मौक़ा मिला तो मैं अपने माननीय मंत्री जी की तवज्जह दो चार बातों की तरफ़ दिलाना चाहता हूं। जहां तक हमारे देश का ताल्लुक़ है, विदेशियों के आने से हमारे देश की तमाम दस्तकारी खत्म हो गयी और हमारा देश दिन ब दिन ग़रीब होता चला गया इस में हम सभी सहमत हैं। जब इस देश के अन्दर राजनीतिक आन्दोलन उठा और अपने देश की आर्थिक अवस्था को हम ने संभालना चाहा, तो सब से पहले स्वदेशी की आवाज़ इस देश में उठाई गयी। हर एक विचार के आदमी ने अपने देश की उन्नति के लिये स्वदेशी की भावना का प्रचार किया और आज तक कांग्रेस की हिस्ट्री में स्वदेशी की भावना को फ़ैलाया गया। पूजनीय महात्मा गांधी जब मैदान में आए तो उन्होंने उस प्रचार के अलावा कुछ अमली सबक़ भी हम को दिया और बतलाया कि हम लोग केवल प्लैटफार्म पर लैक्चर न दें, बल्कि अपने देश की दस्तकारी की उन्नति करने के लिये, देश से ग़रीबी को निकालने के लिये, हमें अपने घरेलू उद्योग धन्धों को बढ़ाना चाहिये। और वे तब बढ़ सकते हैं कि जब उन के लिये हम कोई बाज़ार तैयार करें। जब तक किसी चीज़ के लिये कोई बाज़ार तैयार नहीं होता है, उसकी मांग नहीं बढ़ती है, और वह उद्योग धंधा तरक्की नहीं कर सकता है। पूज्य महात्मा गांधी जी ने कांग्रेस के सब सदस्यों पर यह शर्त लगाई थी कि वह सब खद्दर पहिनें ताकि इस देश में कपड़े की दस्तकारी बढ़े, उन्होंने देश और जनता का ध्यान ग्रामोद्योग की तरफ दिलाया और हर क्षेत्र में स्वदेशी अपनाने की भावना का प्रचार किया। काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज और दूसरे देशी घरेलू धंधों को देश में बढ़ाने पर उन्होंने सदा ज़ोर दिया। लेकिन मुझे यह कहते हुए बहुत दुःख होता है कि हमने उन पर पूरी तरह अमल नहीं किया नहीं तो आज हमारे देश की हालत और ही होती। यह मैं मानता हूं कि आज सब जगह कांग्रेस की अक्सरियत है, लेकिन यह हक़ीक़त है कि कांग्रेस की अक्सरियत होते हुए भी आज तक कांग्रेस जिस नीति पर चलती रही है, उस नीति को हम यहां गवर्नमेंट में पावर में आकर चला नहीं पा रहे हैं। इसका कारण क्या है, इस के बारे में हमें और आपको सोचना है। जितनी भी पार्टियों के मेम्बर आज इस सभा में हैं, इनमें से बहुत से पहले कांग्रेस में भी थे और पुराने कांग्रेस नेताओं के साथ उन्होंने सदा स्वदेशी वस्तुओं का इस्तेमाल करने पर ज़ोर दिया, लेकिन अब वह भावना देश भर में अमल में नहीं आ पा रही है इसलिये इस सदन में जितनी भी पार्टियां हैं उन सब को मिलकर अपने देश के अन्दर स्वदेशी की भावना को फैलाना चाहिए। क्योंकि यह बात निश्चित् है कि जब तक स्वदेशी की भावना देश में नहीं फैलती है, हम इस मुल्क से

ग़रीबी, बेकारी और भुखमरी को नहीं निकाल सकते हैं। इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि यह ठीक है कि आप इस तरह का बिल ला रहे हैं और यह सोच रहे हैं कि फ़लां इंडस्ट्री पर किसका कंट्रोल रहे और किसका न रहे, या कौन सी दस्तकारी अच्छी है, कौन सा कारखाना ज्यादा माल पैदा कर रहा है और कौन सा ज्यादा पैदा नहीं कर रहा है, या किस कारखाने में मालिकों और मज़दूरों के बीच लड़ाई है और किस में नहीं है, यह सब बातें आपके लिए जानना और करना आवश्यक है। लेकिन सब से बड़ी आवश्यक बात यह है कि जबतक देश के अन्दर स्वदेशी की भावना नहीं फैलती है, तबतक ग्रामोद्योग और कारखाने तरक्क़ी नहीं कर सकते हैं।

मैं आप को बतलाऊं कि हम आज यहां क्या देखते हैं। हम यहां इस पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर चुनकर आये, तो हमने यहां एक नई चीज़ देखी कांग्रेस के जितने मेम्बर्स हैं वह सब तो खद्दर पहिन कर यहां आते हैं और अमली तौर पर देश की उन्नति करने में लगे हुए हैं लेकिन हमारे राजभोज सरीखे भाई जो आये दिन अछूतों के वास्ते शोर मचाते हैं कि उनको रोटी चाहिए, कपड़ा चाहिए, मकान चाहिए, और नौकरी चाहिये, तो उन तथा कथित नेता जी से यह पूछा जाय कि जनाब आप शोर तो उनके लिये इतना मचाते हैं, लेकिन आपने उनकी क्रय शक्ति बढ़ाने के लिए अमली काम क्या किया। अगर आप खद्दर पहिनें तो उससे आपके जो ग़रीब भाई चर्खा चलाते हैं और कपड़ा बुनते हैं उनको काम मिलेगा और उनके काम की तरक्क़ी होगी, इसी तरह अगर आप देशी जूते पहिनेंगे तो आप ही के भाई लोग जो जूता बनाने का व्यवसाय करते हैं उनका काम चलेगा और वह पैसा उनको मिलेगा। यह सब जो करना उनको उचित है वह तो करते नहीं, उल्टे कांग्रेस ने जिसने अछूतों के लिये शुरू से प्रयत्न किया और उनको ऊंचा उठाया और अब तक उनके सुधार में लगी हुई है, उसकी खिलाफ़त करते हैं और विरोध करते हैं और कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस ने अछूतों के लिये कुछ नहीं किया। आप अछूत भाइयों के नुमायन्दे बनने का दावा तो करते हैं, लेकिन आप में मैं स्वदेशी का सर्वथा अभाव पाता हूं। आपके ऊपर अंग्रेज़ी तहज़ीब का असर है, टाई, कालर, पतलून और सूटबूट धारण करते हैं। विदेशी वेशभूषा और विलायती कपड़े पहिन कर आप अछूतों का उद्धार करने चले हैं और कांग्रेस वालों को मुफ़्त में बदनाम करते हैं। आप हमें क्या कहते हैं? हमारा तो शुरू से ही यह ध्येय रहा है कि ग़रीबों की भलाई करें, अछूतोद्धार करें और हम तो सिर से पैर तक सब देशी कपड़ा पहिनते हैं और हमारी कुल पोशाक का एक एक पैसा ग़रीब भाइयों को जाता है और देश से ग़रीबी के दूर करने में काम आता है। इसलिए आपके लिए यह किसी तरह से शोभा नहीं देता कि आप हम पर इस तरह का लांछन लगायें।

(*Interruption*)

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज (शोलापुर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियां) : मुझे बोलने का मौक़ा दिया जाय।

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. I do not quite understand Hindi, but I do hope the hon. Member is keeping to the subject and addressing the Chair and not another Member of the House.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं इसके लिए माफ़ी चाहता हूं कि मुझे कुछ अपने लायक़ दोस्त के बारे में यहां पर ज़िक्र करना पड़ा। अब मैं अपने माननीय मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि आप अगर प्लानिंग कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को देखेंगे तो उसमें साफ़ तौर पर यह लिखा हुआ है कि प्रजातंत्र में गवर्नमेंट क्या है? उसमें बतलाया गया है कि गवर्नमेंट

[श्री आर० डी० मिश्र]

के दो हिस्से हैं, एक पालिसी मेकिंग पार्ट होता है और वह गवर्नमेंट का चुना गया हिस्सा होता है जिसको पोलीटिकल एक्जीक्यूटिव कहते हैं, जिसमें हमारे मिनिस्टर और कैबिनट वगैरह होते हैं। गवर्नमेंट का दूसरा हिस्सा वह होता है जिसमें परमानेंट सिविल सर्वेन्ट्स होते हैं। गवर्नमेंट के चुने गये हिस्से का काम पालिसी बनाना होता है और इस परमानेन्ट एक्जीक्यूटिव का उस पालिसी को अमल में लाने का काम है और इलेक्टेड पार्टी का पालिसी बनाने के साथ साथ यह भी देखना काम है कि जो पालिसी उन्होंने बनाई है, उस पर दूसरा हिस्सा ठीक ठीक तरह अमल भी कर रहा है या नहीं और उन स्कीमों को कार्यरूप में परिणत भी कर रहा है या नहीं जो उन्होंने चाक आउट की हैं। यहां मैं मिनिस्टर साहब की खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि वह यह भी देखें कि जो पालिसी वह फ्रेम करते हैं, उस पर एक्जीक्यूटिव यक़ीन करती है और ईमानदारी से उस पर अमल करती है या नहीं। आज हम देखते हैं कि क़ानून और पालिसी तो ठीक ठीक और अच्छे बनाये जाते हैं, लेकिन वह पालिसी अमल में नहीं आ रही है। आज हम चाहते हैं कि देश में काटेज इंडस्ट्री बढ़े, इस देश से बेरोज़गारी जाय और लोगों को रोजगार मिले और आजकल पढ़े लिखे लोगों में जो काम से जरा एक घृणा सी पैदा हो गई है, वह दूर हो जाय और वह उद्योग धन्धों में लग जायें। हम यहां पर अपने लिये कपड़ा बनाने लगें, जूते तैयार करने लगें और दूसरे काम धंधे भी करने लगें। इसके साथ ही मिनिस्टर साहब का यह फर्ज हो जाता है कि वह यह देखें कि उनकी जो एक्जीक्यूटिव है वह पूरी तरह उनकी स्कीम पर अमल करती है और उनकी पालिसी पर उसको पूरा विश्वास है। मैं आज देखता हूं कि हमारी एक्जीक्यूटिव को कांग्रेस की बेसिक पालिसी के ऊपर एतबार नहीं है। हमारी कांग्रेस की पालिसी क्या थी? खद्दर, लेकिन उनका एतबार खद्दर में नहीं। गवर्नमेंट के सुप्रीम हेड पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू जो प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं खद्दर पहिनते हैं, लेकिन गवर्नमेंट के सेक्रेटरीज और कनकंस आदि पर कोई असर नहीं, वह वही विलायती कपड़े और वेशभूषा धारण करते हैं।

Pandit D. N. Tiwary (Saran South): On a point of order. How is it relevant to this Bill?

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर आप इस बिल के दौरान में स्वदेशी की बात नहीं सुनना चाहते हैं तो यह बिल बेकार है।

डा० जाटववीर (भरतपुर—सवाई माधोपुर—रक्षित—अनुसूचित जातियां) : ये बेकार नहीं है, ठीक है।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मुझे माननीय सदस्य के आक्षपों का जवाब देने के लिये टाइम मिलना चाहिये।

Mr. Chairman: Again, I would appeal to the hon. Member to keep to the subject. I do not quite understand Hindi well. The hon. Member should not waste any time in speaking on other matters outside the Bill.

Shri R. D. Misra: Madam, as you do not understand Hindi, I shall speak in English. Government consists of two parts. One is the policy-making part. That is the elected portion of the Government and consists of Ministers. The other portion is the executive that consists of the permanent civil servants. It is the duty of the policy making part to see that the other portion of the Government faithfully carries out the policy laid down by it and implements the schemes that are framed. Here, I submit to the hon. Minister that he must see that the executive believes in the policy which he wants it to follow and that it carries out that policy. From the beginning, I am seeing not

a single clerk or Secretary or any other person in the Government.....

Mr. Chairman: Policy-making and things of that kind, I am afraid, do not come under this particular Bill. I would beg of him to stick to matters concerning the Bill.

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : मैडम क्या नैं बोल सकता हूं ? हम लोगों को भी जवाब देने के लिए टाइम मिलना चाहिए ।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member has not finished his speech yet. He may continue.

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : इस बिल के सिलसिले में मुझे एक, दो, शुबहे हैं जो मैं आप को बतलाना चाहता हूं । इस बिल के अन्दर अब तक एक लाख की मियाद रक्खी गयी थी कि एक लाख से ज्यादा मालियत वाले कारखाने के ऊपर गवर्नमेंट कंट्रोल रक्खेगी । मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो तक़रीर की थी उस में उन्हों ने बतलाया कि एक कारखाने के संबंध में इस ऐक्ट का प्रयोग हुआ परन्तु अब यह तरमीम भी आ गयी कि जो कारखाने व उद्योग धन्धे एक लाख से कम के भी हैं, उनके ऊपर भी यह बिल लागू हो सके तो मुझे यह अंदेशा पैदा हो गया कि जो हमारे देश में छोटे २ उद्योग धंधे हैं, काटेज इंडस्ट्रीज वगैरह हैं, उन पर भी यह बिल असर करेगा और हमारी जो मंशा है कि हमारे देश में ये उद्योग धंधे बढ़ें, वह पूरी न होगी और यह बिल उनकी उन्नति में दिक्कत डालेगा ।

कहीं ऐसा न हो कि इन छोटे छोट उद्योग धंधों को खत्म करने के लिये यह बिल लागू हो जाय । मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि इस में जो आप दफा चार को निकाल कर यह अख्त्यार एग्जिक्यूटिव गवर्नमट को दे रहे हैं.....

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : चमड़े के उद्योग के लिये भी कुछ बोलिये, लहर तो हो गया ।

श्री आर० डी० मिश्र : चमड़ा भी इस में ही है, आप ने देखा होगा ।

मैं यह कह रहा था कि जो दफा ४ आप निकाल रहे हैं उस दफा का इस्तेमाल इस तरह का न हो कि हमारी पालिसी तो छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों को मदद करने की है लेकिन एग्जिक्यूटिव गवर्नमेंट उसका इस्तेमाल किसी और तरह कर दे ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जहां आप ने न्यू आर्टिकल्स की तारीफ की है उस में आप ने सूत, रेशम और ऊन शामिल किये हैं । साथ में सोप मेकिंग को भी शामिल किया गया है । हमारे ग्रामोद्योग धंधों के अन्दर यह चीजें थीं । अब नये नये उद्योग धंधे करने वाले नई चीजें बनायेंगे, तो कहीं ऐसा न हो कि बड़े बड़े पूंजिपति इनकी उन्नति से कुढ़ कर इस बिल की आड़ में इस तरह की कोशिश न करें कि उन को सामान न मिले और उन का काम खत्म हो जाय । हम को तो ऐसा काम करना है जिस से हमारे देश में छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे और दस्तकारियां बढ़ें । मेरी गुजारिश यह है कि आप ऐसी कोशिश करें कि हमारी एग्जिक्यूटिव गवर्नमेंट को यकीन आ जाय कि हमारी सरकार हमारे घरेलू उद्योग धंधों की तरक्की करना चाहती है ताकि वह खुद भी उस पर अमल करें और दूसरे भाइयों को यह तरगीब दें कि वह भी हमारे देश का ही बना सामान इस्तेमाल करने लगें ताकि यहां स्वदेशी वस्तुओं का मार्केट बढ़े, हमारे लोगों की पर्चेजिंग पावर बढ़े, देश की गरीबी का नाश हो और लोगों की हालत अच्छी हो ।

श्री पी० एन० राजभोज : इस देश की इन्डस्ट्री के बारे में मेरा कहना यह है कि देहातों में जो छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे हैं जैसे चमड़े का उद्योग है, शू मेकिंग, रोप मेकिंग आदि चमड़े के उद्योगों की समृद्धि होनी चाहिये ।

[श्री पी० एन० राजभोज]

मैं जापान गया था और वहां मैं ने इन्डस्ट्रीज के बारे में काफी अध्ययन किया। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह से जापान में कोआपरेटिव बेसिस पर इन्डस्ट्रीज चलाई जा रही हैं और जिस प्रकार से वहां उन की उन्नति हो रही है उसी प्रकार से हमारे देश में भी हो तो देश की बहुत समृद्धि होगी। हमारे देश की पंच वर्षीय योजना में कई बातें लिखी हुई हैं, लेकिन आखिर वह अमल में कैसे आयेंगी। जब तक आप मासेज़ विशेष कर दलित वर्ग के लोगों का कोआपरेशन नहीं लेंगे तब तक हम अपने उद्देश्य में कैसे सफल होंगे? जब भी मैं कुछ बोलता हूं तो आप लोग कहते हैं कि विरोधी पार्टी से बोल रहा है। श्री अलगू राय शास्त्री ने कहा कि धंधे के बारे म तो यह बनिया गवर्नमट है लेकिन नौकरी के बारे में ब्राह्मण गवर्नमेन्ट है। मैं ब्राह्मणों के खिलाफ नहीं हूं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूं कि जो यहां के चमार हैं, महार हैं, और दूसरे अछूत जाति के लोग हैं उन सब को बराबरी का हक मिलना चाहिये। सन् १९५० में दस करोड़ का चमड़े का माल बाहर गया। हमारे देश में चमड़ा इतना ही इम्पार्टेन्ट है जितना कि खद्दर। मैं खद्दर के खिलाफ नहीं हूं, पर यह बात सत्य है। खद्दर महंगा हो गया लेकिन चमड़ा सस्ता हो गया। सिर्फ इस लिये कि यह हमारे दश की चीज़ है। इस को भी गांधी जी का आश्रय प्राप्त था और हमारे अछत भाई इस को बनाते थे। लेकिन अब हमारे भाई जो गांधी जी का नाम ले कर खद्दर पहिनते हैं वह मशीनों के लिये कहते हैं कि बिना इस के हमारा काम नहीं चल सकता। मेरी प्रार्थना तो यही है कि कम से कम जो छोट छोटे धंधे हैं जैसे टेनिंग, रोप मेकिंग, शू मेकिंग आदि व अपने देश के उद्योग हैं और मिनिस्टर महोदय को उनकी सहायता करनी चाहिये। जो हमारे गवर्नमेंट के आफिसर्स हैं उन को भी इन्स्ट्रक्शन देना चाहिये कि वह ऐसा करें जो हमारे आफिसर्स काला बाज़ारी करते हैं, पैसा लेते हैं, और करप्ट हैं और जो उद्योग धंधों के बढ़ाने में मदद नहीं करते उन को क्लिअर इन्स्ट्रक्शन देना चाहिये कि वह एफिशिएन्ट बनें और उद्योग धंधों की सहायता करें। साथ में उन से यह भी कहना चाहिये कि उनको पब्लिक के साथ अच्छी तरह से बरताव करना चाहिये। जब तक देश में छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे सहकारिता क आधार पर नहीं बढ़ाये जायेंगे तब तक गरीब लोगों की कोई मदद नहीं हो सकेगी। आज आप के साथ बिड़ला साहब और टाटा साहब हैं और वह हम लोगों को खत्म करने की सोच रहे हैं। लेकिन हम लोगों को गरीबों की मदद हर तरह से करनी चाहिये। यह मेरी प्रार्थना है। आज हर एक आदमी को दो रुपये रोज़ मज़दूरी मिलती है। अगर उस दो रुपय में स आप चार आना ले लें तो महीने म करीब आठ रुपय हो जाते हैं और वर्ष में करीब ९५ रु० हो जाते हैं। अगर आप छोटे छोट उद्योग धन्धो को कोआपरेटिव बेसिस पर चलावें तो दस वर्ष में वह भी एक फैक्टरी क मालिक बन सकते हैं या कम से कम उस के शेअर होल्डर तोबन ही सकते हैं। आज कल जो स्कीमें बनती हैं वे कैपिटलिस्ट लोगों के लिये बनती हैं। लकिन जो गरीब और श्रमजीवी लोग हैं अगर उनके लिये छोटे छोट धंधों की स्कीमें हों और गवर्नमट उन को ज्यादा से ज्यादा मदद दे तो उस से गवर्नमट को ही लाभ होगा और लोगों का कोआपरेशन भी उस को मिल जायेगा। अभी तो बिल सलेक्ट कमेटी में जा रहा है, अगर उस के लिये कोई सजेशन्स होंगें तो मैं भेजूंगा। लेकिन हाउस में मेरे बोलने का मतलब यह है कि चमड़े का जो बहुत बड़ा धंधा है उस को आगे बढ़ाने क लिये कम से कम

चमड़े के काम करने वालों को सहायता देने की पूरी कोशिश की जायेगी । आज कूपर ऐंड एलेन कम्पनी और बाटा कम्पनी जैसी जो बड़ी बड़ी कम्पनियें हैं वे बहुत मुनाफा उठाती हैं और मजे करती हैं । लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि जो हमारे देश के सच्चे नुमाइन्दे हैं, जो चमड़े का काम करने वाले देहातों में हैं उन को लाभ होना चाहिये । गांधी जी का कहना था कि इस देश में छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधे होने चाहियें और उस में काम करने वाले गरीब लोगों को मदद मिलनी चाहिये । मैं भी पहले गांधी जी के आश्रम में था । आज हमारा और आप का मतभेद हो गया है लकिन मैं जानता हूं कि वह क्या करते थे । अगर आप चाहते हैं कि देश की उन्नति हो तो आप को छोटे छोटे धंधों की तरफ ध्यान देना होगा ।

सभापति जी, आप ने कृपा कर के मुझे कुछ बोलने का समय दे दिया उस के लिये मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं । अब मैं आप का ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता क्योंकि आप ने मुझे केवल साढ़े बारह बजे से एक तक का समय दिया था ।

मुझे उम्मीद है कि मन्त्री हाउस के सामने जो दो एक सजशन्स रखे हैं उन को कामर्स मिनिस्टर और कांग्रेस के लोग अमल में लाने की कोशिश करेंगे ।

हमारे जिन भाई ने मेरे लिये कुछ शब्दों का उच्चारण किया है, उन से मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मैं तो यही कहता हूं कि जो लोग कामगर हैं, अच्छा काम करने वाले हैं उन की सहायता की जानी चाहिये । जब मैं कुछ कहता हूं तो आप कहते हैं कि क्रिटिसाइज करते हैं । मैं पूछता हूं कि हमारे देश का जो कच्चा चमड़ा है वह बाहर क्यों जाता है ? उस को देश में रखिये, उस के लिये फैक्टरीज खोलिये । छोटे छोटे लोगों की पैसे से सहायता कीजिये । आप को यहां पर एक लाख रुपये की शर्त नहीं रखनी चाहिये । आज कल जो लोग स्कीमें बनाते हैं वह बड़े बड़े आई० सी० एस० आफिसर्स हैं । वह तो देहातों को देखने के लिये भी नहीं जाते हैं । बहुत हुआ तो डिस्ट्रिक्ट में चले गये और वहीं से रिपोर्ट बना कर भेज दिया करते हैं । उन को यह भी पता नहीं होता कि देहातों की परिस्थिति क्या है । उन को ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये ।

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Gurupadaswamy. May I remind the hon. Member that I propose calling the hon. Minister to reply at 12-45, and I would like to give an opportunity to one more Member, if possible.

Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy (Mysore): I do not have sufficient time to explain all those points and therefore I shall put all the points as briefly as possible.

To me this Bill seems to give a new lease of life to private enterprise. According to the provisions of the Bill, if in an industry there is a fall in the level of production or in the quality of production and it is not managed well, then Government may propose to take over its management and protect it from collapse. So it is a sort of protection given by Government, indirectly, against the collapse of private enterprise. I do not want that industry should collapse simply because it is managed by private enterprise. But I must see through the ultimate purpose for which this Bill has been brought before the House. Some of the Members like Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand are feeling nervous about the Bill. But my advice is that they need not be nervous, because this Bill is intended to support and safeguard private enterprise. (*An Hon. Member*: How?) If you care to read the provisions of the Bill you will understand that when an industry is taken over by Government for management for a period of time, it is intended to be returned back to original owners after the industry is put on a sound basis. That is, it will be managed by the Government for some time to put it on a sound basis. Then it will be returned to the former owners. That is the intention of the Bill. So I say this Bill confers a new lease of life on private enterprise.

[Shri M. S. Gurupadaswamy]

It safeguards the continuation of private capitalism in India. Definitely it is not a measure taken towards nationalisation. The hon. Minister in his speech said that this is not a method of nationalisation at all. I agree with him. But on the contrary I say this is a move against nationalisation of industries. So this Bill has a different purpose altogether, that is, to break the back of nationalisation. No Member has pointed out that the Bill has got this purpose. So I want to bring home to the hon. Members that this Bill is definitely meant to safeguard private enterprise in the land and it is definitely against nationalisation.

We know the policy of the Government of India. It is nothing but a jumble of nonsense. We do not know where we are about the industrial policy. He often refers to the policy statement of 1948. It is as much confused as the recent policy advocated by the hon. Minister himself. It is not very clear; it is muddled, confused and in this confusion we do not know where we stand and we do not know whether this Government is driven with a social ideal, and with a social purpose. I feel that the Minister and the entire Ministry are suffering from some sort of a hiccup of social obscurantism and there is no social ideal visible on the part of the Commerce and Industry Ministry. So this Bill just reflects the confused state of affairs which is prevalent in the industrial set-up of India.

Now I will draw the attention of the hon. Minister to one or two other points. They are very important in my view. In England there is a Board of Trade. The Board of Trade is a supreme body and the President of the Board of Trade is a Member of the Government and that Board of Trade supervises the entire industrial machinery of England. The Board is independent and there is no interference from anybody. So the Board is given enormous opportunity to intervene and regulate any industry. If the industry is not running well, if there is mismanagement, then the Board of Trade, of its own accord, and without taking the advice of any intermediary body, can take over that concern itself. That method is better than the method that is advocated here. Here the procedure is rather cumbrous. First of all, the Government have to intimate to the Council to enquire whether a particular industry is running well or not. After sufficient investigation by a board appointed by the Government, it may then take action. This will take a lot of time and there will be a lot of delay in the process. This procedure is not very advisable, in the circumstances. I would rather advocate that the British method might be followed in this matter. That would improve the Bill greatly. I may also point out that in England if a sufficient number of shareholders of a company write to the Government that that company is not running well, then the entire company may be taken over by the Government directly without the advice of any intermediary body.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

There is also a provision in section 169 of the British Companies Act that criminal prosecution may be launched against any company whose affairs are bad. This will keep the company on the alert and they will try to manage the affairs well. Here such a provision is very necessary. It may look very punitive: but really it is not so punitive because it will make the industrialists know their real responsibilities and compel them to take action necessary to run the industry well. These measures are important. The Select Committee may go into the whole question and think of a different procedure altogether. They may try to adopt the procedure that is followed in England.

There is a provision in the Bill that after a particular industry is taken over by the Government, for management, it will be returned back to the owners later. On that ground, I said previously that this would give a fresh lease of life to private enterprise. If an industry is not capable of standing on its own legs, if the owners do not run an industry on sound and proper lines, and if that industry is taken over by the Government, it should be taken over once for all by the Government and nationalised. There is no point in returning it back to the capitalists, after spending government money and energy in putting it on a sound basis. We do not want the industries taken over by the Government to be returned to the original owners. They should be socialised. That only would assure the country with a steady development in industrialisation on correct and progressive lines.

In conclusion, I say that the Government should adopt a very bold policy in this matter. They should think of applying this Bill in a more effective manner. After the operation of the Act for one year, I have

come to the conclusion that the Government is not capable of implementing the provisions of the Act. Though the Act has conferred enormous powers on the Government, they are incapable of using these powers against the reactionary industrialists. Therefore, merely granting more powers does not in any way ensure steady industrial development of the country. What is necessary is effective action, bold action and action with vision. After passing this amending Bill with suitable amendments as suggested by me, Government may think of more effective action with a view to develop the industrial organisation of the country on proper, sound and scientific lines.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Before I proceed to reply to the debate, I have one request to make of you and the House, *viz.*, that to the Members of the Select Committee, the following two names may be added:

(1) Shrimati Anasuyabai Kale.
(2) Shri Paidi Lakshmayya.

I hope the House will agree to this.

With regard to the general debate, eleven hon. Members have spoken. I think it will be conceded that the debate proceeded on a very high level which I think is only right and proper when dealing with a subject of this nature. We have had the benefit of the advice of hon. Members who have exercised considerable amount of thought on this matter, and I particularly single out the speech made by the illustrious predecessor of mine in this office, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, who gave me very powerful support.

I shall first deal with some of the points that he has raised. It is very heartening for me to feel that, after all, I am only following in the trial blazed by him. As I was a Member of this House at the time when this Bill was introduced I felt very strongly that the hon. Member who was then in charge of the Bill had adopted the correct attitude, and it gives me a certain amount of pleasure that it has come back where he began.....

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: Take him to your Benches.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: He will come in good time. Why hustle.

.....and that the changes which he had in mind have now been formally proposed to this House.

One point that hon. Dr. Mookerjee made which I would like to touch. He said that it might be necessary for us to consider the establishment of some kind of body—he called it an Industrial Management Corporation—to take over the management of some of these industrial units which we feel should be dealt with under the provisions of this particular amending Bill. And he also very rightly stressed on the need for acquiring adequate finance for this body. I must acknowledge that my thoughts have been running in this direction for some time past, and I have been discussing this question of creating some body which would be analogous to what is called a Court of Wards in the States when they have to deal with landed estates. That is, either during the time of the minority of an estate or the imbecility of the owner.....

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: Or lunacy!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Imbecility covers multitudes of other things as well.

.....Government takes over and manages the estate and ultimately hands it over to the parties, to the rightful owners. I felt that probably we would have to have some such body. I am asking various people who are in the know of matters like this to examine this point. At the same time, if I had probably brought forward a suggestion of this nature, the scare would have been all the greater that not merely do I propose to take over these industries, but I have also got a regular mechanism for keeping these industries within my fold. So, perhaps, if my present proposals take shape, I may bring it up to this House on a later occasion. It would be necessary undoubtedly since our resources are extremely meagre that we cannot afford to allow any portion of it to be wasted, and that is where I value very greatly the advice that has come from hon. Dr. Mookerjee.

Another point that he mentioned was about changes in the management. If a particular managing agent or a managing agency firm or managing director did not act properly, why penalise the shareholders? And what should we do about it? This is not a question which exactly falls within the four corners of this measure, though the Commerce and Industry Ministry is vitally interested in safeguarding the interests of shareholders in any concern. How we propose to deal with this subject is by means of the Indian Companies Act. At the moment, the Act is undergoing revision very rapidly, and proposals are being considered for revising the Act. I have also been taken into confidence by the people who are working on this scheme. A provision like this exists in the U.K. Act, and I

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

do hope that when the proposal finally emerges in the shape of a Bill, we would have a provision of the nature indicated by my hon. friend Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

One question he asked was whether we did consult the Industries Advisory Council. Well, I must say that in these matters, particularly when Government are taking over a lot of powers on themselves, when most of these bodies become purely advisory, the onus in regard to making use of these bodies properly and to allow them to develop a sense of responsibility, is very great, so far as Government are concerned. I am very deeply conscious of this responsibility, and though technically these bodies are advisory, I try within the powers that I have at my disposal to take them very seriously. Actually if any advice they give is not palatable, we try to argue it out and see if we cannot arrive at some kind of settlement. That is why, in regard to this subcommittee of the Industries Advisory Council to scrutinise licensing, I have made them more or less an advisory body in regard to appellate matters, and I am rather proud to tell the House that in regard to the scrutiny made by that body, during the first period, the two matters in which the Government differed from the Licensing Committee were referred to them, and I did not seek to exercise my discretion in the matter. Two appeals came to me, and Government thought that they must be referred to the subcommittee of the Industries Advisory Council. On one of them, they felt that the Licensing Committee was right, and on another they felt that they were wrong, and the Government have accepted their recommendations *in toto*. It is the intention of the Government as far as possible to give these advisory bodies a proper place in the structure of the particular enactment within which they operate.

I have here two communications addressed to the Industries Advisory Council. One is dated the 21st October 1952, and there we are told in regard to the Bill which I had first introduced and then withdrawn, that there is a general measure of support for that. The second one was sent on the 12th March 1953. Unfortunately here, the support is not very general. I have had six communications out of which one wholeheartedly supports the proposal, while in other communications, the particular member expresses his dissent in different degrees, and the emphasis is also different. In some cases, as I stated before, the president of the Federation has been fairly categorical, and the individual members have been a little more politic, and of course, all of them express the hope ultimately that the Government would not damage the climate that now exists in regard to the relationship between Government and private enterprise. I think I have more or less dealt with all the points raised by Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

Dr. S. P. Mookerjee: What about the minimum of Rs. one lakh?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: That question, as I said, will be dealt with by this exemption provision. Very possibly, we may probably stick to a minimum of Rs. one lakh of the total amount of capital employed; whether it is block capital or share capital or reserves, if the total is about a lakh of rupees, very possibly, we need not interfere in those institutions. The amount of labour employed is also a condition to be considered. It may be that a highly mechanised industry may produce goods of the value of lakhs and lakhs of rupees, but employ only ten people. That is a possibility these days. So, we have to frame the rules with an eye on changing it subsequently if we find that it is not workable. But I shall bear in mind this fact and we shall not rope in very small industries partly because as the hon. Member himself pointed out, the administrative responsibility will be very great, and I would not like to extend the area of my responsibility, at any rate, at the present moment.

Now, I shall come to my hon. friend, the acting Leader of the Communist Party—I am sorry I see him going away.

Shri Bansal: He has come back.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I wish to refer to his speech.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: May I assure the hon. Minister that it is not because I want to show him any discourtesy that I am going away. Actually I had communicated to the Deputy-Speaker that I have an unavoidable appointment and have to be away exactly at this point of time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes. I just received a communication.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Very well, Sir, I understand it. I would like to say that I do not at all resent anything that he said. I do maintain that the objectives that we have in mind are the same; there is no difference so far as that is concerned. It is

merely a matter of method. On the methods, we differ—and we know we differ. And if he says that he is disappointed with my speech, well, I am not disappointed that he is disappointed: because I did expect that the manner in which I approached this subject would cause a certain amount of disappointment in the minds of those hon. Members who probably felt that after all, this Minister is coming into his senses and acting in the correct way and is showing some grit; then they find that when I seek to explain my point of view they are naturally disappointed.

Excepting on this question of nationalisation, I do not think I can really take exception to anything that he said. The only difference there is this. I am not going into this question of nationalisation: it may be good or it may be bad—it is not a matter which I am discussing now for the time being. But probably, as a member of the Government which stands committed to a Bill which has been sent by this House to a Select Committee for purposes of nationalisation of one type of industry, I cannot say that I am against or we are against nationalisation. We are not. But the question is the time, the type of industries to be nationalised, the pace at which nationalisation is to be carried on and what are the objectives of nationalisation. Ultimately if the objective are common between the hon. Member and myself, those objectives cannot be subserved by the methods that we follow. After all, nationalisation is a means to an end: it is not the end in itself. The mere fact that we create a bureaucratic machinery to manage industrial concerns instead of the machinery that is now managing it does not mean anything. That which is being controlled by proprietory capitalists can be adjusted in a different way. Here the Government seeks to control industries probably a little more rigorously where proprietory capital comes in. In fact, my own point of view would be that in the case of an industrial concern which is managed by a non-proprietory agent, who is only a paid man of the shareholders, I do not see why I should nationalise it at all. Because after all, the shares—if the holding is broad-based—are invested by the common man and it is from the common man that we seek our capital for future expansion. So it is merely a matter of semantics rather than one of substance, in my view.

Many suggestions that the hon. the acting Leader of the Communist Party made are, I feel, suggestions to which I cannot take any exception. He has referred to the experiment made in China in regard to nationalisation of industries. It is a thing which we do want to understand—how it is being done. It does not mean that we accept the methods that are being followed there, but in regard to nationalised industries—and they form a part of the entire scheme of industries in this country—we would like to know what is being done in China. I am not allergic to any experiments that are carried out either in China or in Soviet Russia. I might confess that the only thing that I found reason to be surprised at was that with my own knowledge of Karl Marx's Capital—it is perhaps very nearly two decades old and I have not had the time to refresh my memory—I thought my hon. friend was running counter to the spirit of Karl Marx's ideas. Karl Marx thought that the end of capitalism must be progressive the smaller units being swallowed by the bigger ones and the bigger being liquidated in the end. Ultimately our aim will also be the same if we have the mouth big enough to swallow and a capacity to digest it. This is my chief fear today. I am not quite sure.

1 P.M.

My hon. friend Mr. Gurupadaswamy said something about Government, about which I wish to deal before I resume my seat. It may be that it is not so much of confused thinking but want of capacity to digest what we would like to swallow. That is our chief trouble. The hon. Member also mentioned the question of Caltex. I think that all that the Government can say about these refineries and the arrangements that we have with these refineries is that they are known to the public. We have nothing to hide; and if any concession is being given, it is being given with open eyes. We felt that in the interests of the country those concessions should be given.

One other matter that the hon. Member mentioned was in regard to a similar provision for taking over tea estates. I do remember that this question was raised by the hon. Member in the Select Committee and I think the proper time for me to deal with that subject is when the Tea Bill comes up before the House. I have promised the Members of the Select Committee that I shall have the question examined, and I think, I shall deal with it at that time.

My hon. friend Mr. Khandubhai Desai also joined issue with me in a manner more or less similar to that of the method adopted by the hon. Mr. Hiren Mukerjee, accusing me of being on the defensive. Well, I think it has

[Shri T. T. Krishnamachari]

become a habit so far as I am concerned. I am always on the defensive and even when I can be on the offensive—perhaps habit is stronger even than intelligence—habit ultimately overcomes my natural inclination to be a little on the offensive. Ten months of office has sobered me down to a considerable extent and I think discretion is the better part of valour.

The big gun for the vested interests —if I may use that word in the purely generic sense—Mr Tulsidas Kilachand spoke and I was almost afraid that he might support the Bill; because, then my hon. friend the acting leader of the Communist Party will say there is collusion between the capitalists and the Government. I was relieved when I found that he was not going to give me any support, any quarter at all. Well, it is a tangled web. As I said, I am a very prosaic person. I hardly know any poetry. Even when I had to learn poetry, I cursed myself. Of course, life is a tangled scheme and I wish the capitalists will tell us how to unravel this scheme and.....

Prof. D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur): What was the poetry which he read and for which he had to curse himself? Were they prescribed for any examination for which he appeared? I do not like to hear that about all kinds of poetry.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Well, Sir, from Edmund Spenser to Swinburn I am afraid I did not like any one of them.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: Not Chaucer?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Commerce is more prosaic than poetic.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: I should like to come back to Mr. Tulsidas Kilachand. He says, 'why should you put something on the statute book which is foreign?' I might tell him that sometimes there are certain foreign elements which the body will stand.

Shri Algu Rai Shastri: The language itself is foreign.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: Somebody has a fracture of the skull and it has got to be bandaged. They use tantalum for that purpose. The one foreign matter which the human body stands is tantalum. You can bandage it with tantalum or even a muscular ligament may be bound up with tantalum. I suggest that the proposed provision is tantalum for private enterprise. I have no doubt that they would develop a tolerance for it in due course in the same way that the human system develops a tolerance for that metal.

Shri Tulsidas: From poetry to surgery!

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: The difficulties which my hon. friend mentioned about section 10, I am afraid, arise out of the wording of the amending Bill. Basically, there is nothing there. He did not read it properly, perhaps.

I may say that I am at a slight disadvantage in regard to the hon. Members who spoke in Hindi. I have had a translation made here, thanks to my colleague who helped me. I do not want to say anything against Hindi as such, but if Hindi is going to mean that we do not speak relevantly, I am afraid we are in for a very bad outlook in the future.

Mr. Damodara Menon said something which I could not quite understand. He wanted me to use this Act in order to make foreign firms employ Indians. I have never confessed that there were no powers with me to make foreign firms employ more Indians. Only, I felt that I cannot go and tell them to promote a particular person or demote a particular person. The whole thing is taken advantage of by the weaker sections. I get letters nowadays from people in foreign firms saying that they have not been promoted. Now, I cannot be an appellate authority. I cannot be a Public Service Commission for private enterprise. Very possibly, in some of the cases which I have investigated, these people have been put in there because they were relatives of some people who were the friends of the British Government in those days. Now, the Britishers are no longer there, and they do not happen to be related to me or any other person in the Government. Very possibly, these firms have no use for them and have sent them away. I do dislike the idea of any Indian being victimised in any sense, and I have enough powers in my hands to see that nobody victimises an Indian. But I do not have to use this Act for this purpose, nor is it proper to do it. Basically, I cannot be induced to accept the position that merely because a particular act does not suit me, or I do not like it, therefore I can use section 15(b) as it is sought to be amended. It would not be fair. If I do not like a foreigner, I can ask him to go, but so long as he is here and he is permitted to function here, he should be treated in the

ıme way as anybody else. Whether is a foreign firm or an Indian firm, it misbehaves and the provisions of ew section 15(b) are attracted, they ill be used.

My hon. friend Mr. Bansal, as usual, as been very constructive. We can-ot altogether resist occasionally run-ing away with things. One sugges-on hat he made is, I think, worth-hile for the Select Committee to con-der; namely, that in Section 18A(1) e have said that Government will ontinue the management of the indus-y for five years. Now, what hap-ens thereafter? It is a thing that ruck me at one time, but my hon. iend has pointed out that there is a acuna there. Probably, the Select ommittee would find out ways and leans of providing for the continu-nce of Government control, if it is ecessary, and would provide for re-erence to Parliament in the manner ı which it thinks best.

My hon. friend said something bout the difficulties of the smaller nits. I must join issue with him ere. The Commerce and Industry Iinistry, or for that matter any other conomic section, is available to the nall man. Every letter that comes om anybody is being attended to. he only trouble is that they want e to grant licences by telegram. I gree that it is a good thing, because helps the ways and means position f the Posts and Telegraphs Depart-ent. Every morning when I come ut, I find a pile of telegrams outside. ny genuine grievance of a small in-ustry is being attended to. I am not erely open to receive the big people, ut I see even the very small man and o do my colleagues. So, I do not ink that that is a very correct harge. He wants me to be pragma-c and not idealistic. I am afraid y hon. friend Mr. Tulsidas might robably think that I am far too ragmatic and not idealistic. I leave e two hon. Members who have close aison with the vested interests to ecide whether I am pragmatic or idealistic. So far as I am concern-d, it does not matter what you call e. Whether you call me pragmatic r idealistic, I do not quarrel with the ne or the other of the appellations.

I come last to Mr. Gurupadaswamy. am afraid while I had to say some-ing about Hindi I have also got omething to say against English. oreign language is a curse. We do not nderstand the language very well. nd I can only see an illustration of in the speech made by my hon. riend Mr. Gurupadaswamy. He says here is a lot of confusion in the mind of Government, that we have no policy. I think the confusion was due to the lack of ability to understand precisely this language. He said something which I could not understand. Whether he is confused or I am confused or whether we are both confused, I do not know!

Again, there is a little confusion in his understanding when he referred to the Board of Trade. He said there is a Board called the Board of Trade in England. Probably there is a blackboard in the Board of Trade office in England! It is not a Board at all. There is the President of the Board of Trade. He is not a President of any body. It is merely one of those usual fictions attached to various offices and institutions in Britain, and they do not change the name even though they have no Board. What apparently my friend had in mind was a provision in the Companies Act. In regard to that, it is administered in England by the President of the Board of Trade and by his Department. It is not a Board that does it. There are not so many members as in the Industries Advisory Council. The members' advice need not be sought. The Minister acts on his own and the permanent secretariat carries out his behests. As I said in reply to the suggestions made by Dr. Mookerjee, I think when the new Bill to amend the Indian Companies Act comes into being, Mr. Gurupadaswamy will not be disappointed. There will be provisions there analogous to the provisions in the United Kingdom Act which will empower Government or the authority that will be acting under the direction of Government to take appropriate action in the case of companies which do not behave properly. But I am not anticipating it, nor do I feel that an amendment of the Indian Companies Act will suit my purpose. This is a different setting altogether. And very possibly the two enactments might be complementary when the new Indian Companies Act is enacted. But for the time being I think we have got to go on with what powers we can secure under the amending Bill.

Finally, I think I must express my gratitude to the House for a generally tolerant attitude towards this Bill and a very kindly eye on the short comings of the Bill such as might be found by the Select Committee.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill to amend the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951, be referred to a

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

Select Committee) consisting of Shri N. V. Gadgil, Prof. Diwan Chand Sharma, Shri Balwant Sinha Mehta, Shri Govind Hari Deshpande, Shri Fulsinhji B. Dabhi, Shri Upendranath Barman, Dr. Jayantilal Narbharam Parekh, Shri Abdus Sattar, Shri S. C. Deb, Shri Bhupendra Nath Misra, Shri Bhagwat Jha 'Azad' Shri Radhelal Vyas, Shri Satyendra Narayan Sinha, Shri K. G. Deshmukh, Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha, Shri Raghavendrarao Srinivasrao Diwan, Shri Gajendra Prasad Sinha, Shri G. R. Damodaran, Shri C. R. Basappa, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri Tribhuan Narayan Singh, Shri Shri Chand Singhal, Shri Baij Nath Kureel, Shri Chaturbhuj V. Jasani, Shri Vishwambhar Dayal Tripathi, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri Durga Charan Banerjee, Shri Mangalagiri Nanadas, Shri Kamal Kumar Basu, Shri G. D. Somani, Dr. Indubhai B. Amin, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri Choithram P. Gidwani, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri, Shri B. Rajagopala Rao, Shrimati Anasuyabai Kale, Shri Paidi Lakshmayya, and the Mover, with instructions to report by the 29th April, 1953."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I appoint Shri N. V. Gadgil to be the Chairman of this Committee.

The House then adjourned till a Quarter Past Eight of the Clock on Thursday, the 23rd April, 1953.